

THE CLERGY REVIEW

A MAGAZINE FOR THE CLERGY

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

VOLUME VII, No. 1.

JANUARY, 1934.

Proprietors

"THE UNIVERSE,"

(Associated Catholic Newspapers, 1912, Ltd.)

1, Arundel Street, London, W.C.2

BOOKS RECEIVED

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, Anglican Minister, Catholic Priest, Roman Cardinal, by J. Elliot Ross. (London: George Allen & Unwin. pp. xxi. and 258. 7s. 6d.)

THE HEART OF THE BIBLE, by Jeannie B. Thomson Davies, M.A. Volume Three: The Literature of the New Testament. (London: George Allen & Unwin. pp. 248. 5s.)

LE THOMISME ET LA CRITIQUE DE LA CONNAISSANCE, par Régis Jolivet. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. pp. 152. 10 frs.)

LE MARIAGE EN ITALIE DEPUIS LES ACCORDS DE LATRAN, par le R.P. René Desjardins. (Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 22, rue Soufflot, Paris, 5. pp. 182. 25 frs.)

GRAMMAIRE HEBRAIQUE ELEMENTAIRE, suivie d'une Anthologie et d'un Lexique, par D. Schilling. (Paris: G. Beauchesne. pp. 105.)

TURNING TO GOD, Sermon Notes on Conversion, by the Rev. Edward M. Betowski. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. pp. xviii. and 372. \$2.00.)

THE ONE SACRIFICE, by the Rt. Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D.D. (The Catholic Truth Society of Canada, 67, Bond Street, Toronto, 2. pp. 43. 10 cents.)

THE COMPLETE BENEDICTION BOOK FOR CHOIRS. Edited by Sir R. Terry, Mus.Doc., F.R.C.O. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. xx. and 215. 12s. 6d.)

LA MORALE PHARMACEUTIQUE, par le R.P. Salsmans, S.J. (Société SS. Cosme et Damien, 90, rue des Palais, Brussels, Belgium. pp. 13.)

LES TOXIMANES, par R. Kothen. (Imprimerie Nova et Vetera, 118, rue de Tirlemont, Louvain, Belgium. pp. 28.)

LA QUESTION DES ABORTIFS. (Imprimerie Nova et Vetera, Louvain, Belgium. pp. 26.)

DIRECTOIRE CANONIQUE à l'Usage des Congrégations à Voeux Simples, par le R.P. Dom Pierre Bastien, O.S.B. Quatrième Edition. (Charles Beyaert, rue Notre Dame, Bruges, Belgium. pp. xx. and 591. 14 belgas.)

THE CASE AGAINST THE ENGLISH DIVORCE LAW, by Alfred Fellows. (London: The Bodley Head. pp. xviii. and 239. 7s. 6d.)

NEWMAN AND HIS FRIENDS, by the Rev. Henry Tristram, of the Oratory. With an Introduction by J. Lewis May. Illustrated. (London: The Bodley Head. pp. xiii. and 267. 6s.)

TRACTATUS DE DEO CREANTE ET ELEVANTE, auctore Carolo Boyer, S.J. Editio Altera emendata et aucta. (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana. pp. 545.)

IRELAND'S LOYALTY TO THE MASS, by the Rev. Fr. Augustine, O.M.Cap. With Illustrations by John O'Gorman. (London: Sands & Co. pp. 223. 3s. 6d.)

THE SEPARATED EASTERN CHURCHES, by the Rev. Père Janin. Translated by the Very Rev. Canon P. Boylan, M.A., D.Litt., D.D. (London: Sands. pp. 243. 5s.)

ST. FRANCIS DE SALES IN HIS LETTERS. Edited by the Sisters of the Visitation, Harrow-on-the-Hill. Introduction by the Right Rev. Abbot Butler, O.S.B. Foreword by H.E. Cardinal Bourne. (London: Sands. pp. 282. 7s. 6d.)

BLESSED GEMMA GALGANI, The Holy Maid of Lucca, by Father Germanus, Passionist, Her Spiritual Director. Translated by the Rev. A. M. O'Sullivan, O.S.B. Introduction by the late Cardinal Gasquet, O.S.B. Third Edition, edited by the Rev. Joseph Smith, C.P. (London: Sands. pp. xxiv. and 395. 6s.)

PULPIT AND PLATFORM ADDRESSES, by the Most Rev. Archbishop Downey, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. v. and 157. 5s.)

THOUGHTS FROM ST. BENEDICT, Selected and Arranged for every day of the year, by Maurice Leahy, Hon. Secretary of the Catholic Poetry Society. Foreword by the Rev. T. Agius, O.S.B., B.A. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. xvi. and 112. 2s. 6d.)

THE CHURCH OF ISRAEL, Studies and Essays, by the late Robert Hatch Kennett, D.D. Edited with an Introduction by S. A. Cook. (London: Cambridge University Press. pp. lvi. and 249. 12s. 6d.)

THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUARDIAN

Vol. XI. No. 4. *The Quarterly Journal of the Guild of St. Luke, St. Cosmas, and St. Damian.* October, 1933.

LEADING ARTICLE.—Biological Warfare.

SPECIAL ARTICLES.—(1) Catholic Doctors Confer in Dublin (with photograph). (2) Scientific Jargon. (3) The International Congress of Catholic Physicians. (4) Doctors and the Church. (5) The German Law for the Prevention of Hereditary Diseases. (6) Fewer Births mean Greater Unemployment. (7) The International Congress of Catholic Nurses.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.—Public Resolution Concerning the "Catholic Medical Guardian." The Master of the Guild. Euthanasia in Prussia. Medical Practice in India. Communications for the Guardian.

ORIGINAL ARTICLES.—(1) Diabolical Possession. By Rev. C. W. Howell, S.J., M.Sc. (2) A Critical Consideration of the De Rudder Case. By Dr. F. M. R. Walshe. (3) The Sociological Aspects of Medico-Moral

Problems. By Rev. J. Arthur O'Connor.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES OF BOOKS.—(1) The Sterile Period in Family Life. By Very Rev. Canon Valere J. Coucke and James J. Walshe, M.D., Ph.D. (2) Man and Medicine. By Dr. Henry E. Sigerist. (3) Surgical Nursing: arranged according to the Unit Method by Sister Mary Florence, R.S.M. (4) Clinical Studies for Nurses, etc., etc. Publishers: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London: 43, 44, 45, Newgate Street, E.C.1, 129, Victoria Street, S.W.1, 33, Ashley Place, S.W.1. And at Manchester, Birmingham and Glasgow. Price: 1s. 4d. Annually 5s. (Post Free). Subscription for United States \$1.50. All enquiries to: Editorial & Manager's Offices, 3, St. John's Road, Harrow-on-the-Hill, Middlesex.

FRANCIS TUCKER & CO.

ESTABLISHED 1730 LTD.

Manufacturers of Genuine Beeswax Candles

ALSO SUPPLY

FRAGRANT INCENSE

IN SEVERAL QUALITIES, AND
CHARCOAL for use with INCENSE
OF VARIOUS KINDS.

Cricklewood Lane, London, N.W.2

Telephone: SPEEDWELL 6227

Telegrams: ENLIGHTEN, LONDON



CHALICES from £4-4-0
CIBORIA, MONSTRANCES
and all Church Silver and Metal
Work. Send for book 16.
MEMORIAL TABLETS in BRASS, etc.
from £3. Send for Book 36 to
Actual Makers,
F. OSBORNE & CO. LTD.
87, Eastcastle Street,
Oxford Circus, London, W.1

John Hardman's

John T. Hardman Stained Glass 43, Newhall-Hill
Dunstan J. Powell Birmingham &
Elphège J. Pippet Paintings Mosaics 1, Albemarle
John Hardman Church Decoration St. Piccadilly
& Co. Limited Private Compy London, W.1

R. L. BOULTON & SONS

Catholic Art Sculptors,

Bath Road, CHELTENHAM

ALTARS, Etc., in MARBLE,
STONE or WOOD.

GERALD J. HARDMAN,

5a, Temple-row, BIRMINGHAM.

Telephone: Central 3753.

All kinds of Church Furniture,
Metal Work, Carving in Wood and
Stone, Renovations, Gilding, &c.

CHURCH BUILDINGS IN NEW HOUSING AREAS

HARBROW'S

TEMPORARY AND
SEMI-PERMANENT
BUILDINGS AFFORD
DURABLE, EFFICIENT,
ECONOMICAL AND
EXPEDITIOUS MEANS
OF MEETING ALL
REQUIREMENTS.

ESTD. 50 YEARS.



Semi-permanent Church.

Write for Suggestions, Estimates and Drawings.
Dept. U.

WILLIAM HARBROW, Ltd.

**SOUTH BERMONDSEY,
LONDON — S.E.16**

IN

shelt
say s
well
pers
are
bein
subj
gene
pity
fully
find
I sp
no C
the

T
resp
defa
" M
but
of t
sac
cler
the
of
bet
tha
Lon

THE CLERGY REVIEW

THE NEW DIVORCE BILL

BY THE REV. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

INTRODUCING the second reading of a Bill in 1924, Lord Buckmaster spoke as follows: "I have said before, and I say again, that with them (Catholics) I have no quarrel. I have never been able to find shelter within the shadow of their Church, although I say sincerely that I often wish I could; but I know quite well that, against their armour, reason, argument, logic, persuasion, all fall back blunted. They, and they only, are the people who enjoy the unrivalled privilege of being able to speak with authority and to bind their subjects to accept what they say."¹ In view of this generous estimate of our power and importance, it is a pity that the Catholic standpoint was not more powerfully represented on the Royal Commission, upon the findings of which the present measure is largely based. I speak under correction, but it appears that there was no Catholic on the Commission and only two amongst the 246 people who gave evidence.

The Catholic view differs from the views of those responsible for this measure, not merely in matters of detail and expediency, but *in toto* and fundamentally. "Marriage between Christians is not only a contract, but a Sacrament of the New Law, in which the union of the parties is wrought and ratified by God. In this sacrament, the parties themselves—not any officiating clergyman—are the ministers, each giving consent to the other, and God accepting and sealing the consent of both. When such marriage is validly celebrated between competent persons, and is consummated, so that there is fulfilled in their union the words of Our Lord, 'and they shall be two in one flesh' there exists

¹ *Tablet*, March 15th, 1924, p. 340.

between them a God-made bond of matrimony or *vinculum matrimonii*, in its completeness. The knot is of God's own knitting, and Christ teaches that it is God Himself who is the 'Joiner.' Because the union is thus of God's making and a Divine work, it has the paramount and immutable character of Divine Law, and is absolutely indissoluble except by the death of either party. As a matter of Divine law, or God's own ordinance, it is intangible by any created power, and no human authority, whether ecclesiastical or civil, can have any authority to dissolve it."

The prestige of the Catholic Church in England has increased very considerably since Mgr. Moyes explained the doctrine so concisely before the Commission in 1912,³ and even more considerably since Lord Buckmaster's words in 1924. Catholic Members of Parliament, who may have an opportunity of speaking on this measure, know that a lead given by them will prove a rallying point for many other forces in the country, exactly as it is on the subject of Birth Control. For the principle that marriage is indissoluble is still accepted by the masses of the people in this country, and it was recognized by the law up to 1857. The possibility of divorce by Act of Parliament before that date establishes, if anything, the normal legal indissolubility of the contract in the eyes of the law. Lord Campbell could say in 1835: "It may be considered as absolutely certain that the bar of England could not have furnished a single counsel who would have set his name to the opinion that judicial indissolubility was not a legal quality of every English marriage."³ The Reformation was responsible for the claim of Parliament to dissolve marriage by an Act, but it was an interference of the State which the Church has always and consistently repudiated. "If this stability seems open to exception, however rare the exception may be, as in the case of certain natural marriages between unbelievers, or amongst Christians in the case of those marriages which, though valid, have not been consummated, that exception does not depend on the will of men nor on that of any human power, but on divine law, of which the only guardian

³ *Minutes*, 22.921

³ Quoted by Mr. R. O'Sullivan, *CLERGY REVIEW*, I, p. 258.

and interpreter is the Church of Christ.”⁴ Unless he is quite sure of his ground, theologically and canonically, a Catholic layman would be advised not to be drawn into discussing the absolute indissolubility of non-Christian marriage, the papal power of dissolving non-consummated marriages, and the application of the Pauline Privilege. All these points are rather intricate and technical, and are best covered by taking it as axiomatic that the Church is the interpreter and guardian of Christian marriage, subject to the divine law that the ratified and consummated marriages of Christians are absolutely indissoluble. In view of Clause 5 of the present measure, which introduces new grounds for nullity, the simple meaning of a decree of nullity should be less perplexing than some non-Catholics have affected it to be. Nullity decrees in canonical procedure are in no sense equivalent to a divorce, exactly as Clause 5 of this measure is radically different from Clause 1 which introduces new grounds for divorce.

Relying on Matthew xix., it may be in accordance with the principles of those Christians who are separated from the Church to allow divorce for adultery. Not recognizing the authority of a living voice, in declaring what Our Lord taught, they depend, almost entirely, on the text of the New Testament. With regard to the exceptive clause of Matthew xix., the opinion of many biblical scholars has been tending, for many years past, towards the sense that Our Lord did not allow divorce *a vinculo* even for adultery. The statement of the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham before the Commission in 1912 is as true to-day: “I wish to call attention to the fact that I think is not always before the minds of those who are what may be described as laymen in biblical criticism; that the whole course of biblical investigation for many years past has tended to the point of emphasizing that the mind of Christ Himself was for indissoluble marriage.”⁵ But, without touching on the exegesis of this difficult passage, and no matter what interpretation is given to it, there is no scriptural authority, even of a doubtful character, allowing divorce

⁴ *Casti Connubii*, C.T.S., p. 17.

⁵ *Minutes*, 21.241; Cf. *New Commentary* by Ch. Gore and others, 1928, Vol. II, p. 174.

for any other reason than adultery. The country is still Christian, with an established Church (a fact recognized by Clause 29 of the proposed measure in 1931), and Catholics may make their own the statement contained in the *Minority Report* :

. . . while we do not pretend that non-Christian marriages are necessarily governed by the rules of the Christian society made for Christian marriages, we should claim from that great portion of the nation which professes allegiance to the Christian faith a due regard for Our Lord's teaching representing what in His view is best for the world. . . . To those, and they form the great majority of the nation, who profess allegiance to the Christian Faith in one form or another, it will be almost axiomatic that Our Lord's teaching as to the true conditions of family and social life was intended to promote the general welfare of the world, and has for all Christian people a pre-eminent authority and an imperative claim to their loyal acceptance.⁶

Those in favour of this new measure will maintain that Christians, if they so wish, may remain loyal to their religious principles, and need not seek the legal relief of divorce. One answer to this, as we shall try to point out, is that *de facto* Christians will be penalized by the Bill. But a more radical answer is that the indissolubility of marriage is anterior to any Christian law. The Christian sacramental character of marriage gives an added firmness to the contract,⁷ but it is an error to suppose that the prohibition of divorce is purely a matter for the "Churches" and their adherents. It is a law which has governed human nature from the beginning, and by restoring its pristine character Christ was promoting the general welfare of mankind. The Christian view about marriage is identical with the public welfare view, for the non-observance of the law of indissolubility imperils the well-being of the State by attacking the family, even though a divorce may sometimes appear, on the surface, to be an advantage to a given individual in given circumstances. Therefore, the *Minority Report* stressed, throughout, the claims of Society and the State, and this is obviously the only point of view which will carry much weight with the legislature.

⁶ *Minority Report*, pages 172, 186.

⁷ *C.J.C.*, Canon 1013, §2.

ge
it
th
co
W
oth
an
sac
in
of

T
of
ind
crit
div
con
indi

⁵ p
⁹ T
n. 22
¹⁰ A

The real question at issue is the alternative between the narrow expediency of trying to make the lot of certain people concerned easier and happier, and the wider expediency of strengthening the family life against influences which are threatening its strength and stability. . . . There can be no question that hitherto the strength of English social life has been the family—the home. The evidence is reassuring that among the great bulk of the people, especially among the middle class and artisans, the obligations of marriage are respected and home life is pure and consistent. . . . Our contention, therefore, is that the State, in its own interest, should maintain and not relax the standard of its present marriage law. . . . The provision of exceptions to the life-long tie of marriage must tend to weaken the very things that the State desires to strengthen.⁸

To the suggestion, therefore, that Catholics need not get disturbed about divorce, since they need not have it if they do not want it, we may quote His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop: "It is a matter which vitally concerns the future and well-being of the whole country. We Catholics must never forget—we must never allow others to forget—that we, as Catholics, form an integral and essential part of the nation. . . . We have the most sacred duty to protest in the name of our traditions, in the name of the whole nation, against any violation of moral principles."⁹

II.

The proposed measure is based on the recommendations of the *Majority Report* in 1912, in which the *normal* indissolubility of marriage is accepted. It is a valid criticism to insist that a principle which tolerates divorce in numberless exceptional cases is scarcely consistent with a principle that marriage is normally indissoluble.

That marriage should be normally life-long and indissoluble, and that marriage should be dissoluble on grounds which lend themselves to the easiest collusion, and which seem necessarily to involve the right of either party to put an end to it at will, are contradictory propositions.¹⁰

⁸ pp. 187, 188.

⁹ *Tablet*, October 30th, 1920, p. 585; Cf. also *Majority Report*, n. 223.

¹⁰ *Minority Report*, p. 186.

The alleged causes, appearing to call for a relaxation of the law, must be considered in their inevitable sequel, the ultimate abrogation of the principle of life-long monogamous union.¹¹

In every country which has introduced divorce, statistics show an increasing number as the years pass by. A measure originally intended by a benevolent legislator for a few hard cases is utilized by everyone who has grown weary of an existing marriage. Once the fundamental indissolubility of marriage is assailed by the legislature, it quickly loses its hold on the moral conscience of the people.¹² The interpretation of so tenuous a cause as "mental cruelty," in Clause 10 of the Bill, is open to almost any meaning whatever; we have only to notice the interpretation given by the Courts to the notion of cruelty, in days when a woman petitioner had to prove cruelty in addition to adultery. There are any number of causes which lead to the ruin of married life, in addition to those contained in Clause 1 of the Bill, and there is no reason at all why, in a year or two, such causes as incompatibility of temper, or sickness should not be added to those already proposed.

We find, in fact, what was to be expected. In those countries which have, for many years, extended the grounds for divorce, the authorities are alarmed at the increase in the number of divorces. This is true of America as the *Minority Report* notes; true also of France, on the evidence of a French lawyer who gave evidence; and true also, no doubt, of many other places.¹³ The danger consists not only in an abuse of the law on the part of individuals, but in a general habit of mind, on the part of the people in general, which, following the lead which the law gives, will tend gradually towards divorce by mutual consent—practically another word for promiscuous intercourse. The *Majority Report*, of course, does not want divorce by mutual consent; nobody wants it, I imagine, apart from a few fanatics. But these proposed exceptions "cannot

¹¹ Cf. *Minority Report*, p. 187.

¹² Cf. *Documentation Catholique*, 1929, Vol. XXII, p. 629.

¹³ *Minority Report*, p. 173; *Minutes*, 22.987; *Documentation Catholique*, Vol. XXII, p. 634.

be viewed apart from the principle upon which they are founded, and the consequences which logically follow, and have, in fact, followed, upon its adoption. Those proposals if carried out by legislation, would lead the nation to a downward incline, on which it would be vain to expect to be able to stop half-way."¹⁴

III.

"The causes of marriage failure are, speaking generally, the lack of the sense of responsibility in entering the married state, and the lack of self-control, self-sacrifice and sense of duty in continuing it."¹⁵ It is a fallacy to suppose that the existence of admittedly "hard cases" is due to insufficient facilities for divorce, and that increased facilities will be an effective cure for these ills. Easier divorce will not increase social happiness; rather the reverse, for people will be less careful in contracting marriage and less generous in tolerating mutual defects. The report says "generally speaking," for there are exceptional cases, e.g., insanity that cannot be traced to these causes. But we are apt to have our judgment warped by dwelling too much on "hard" matrimonial cases, and this is particularly true of many of the prominent and notable persons who gave evidence before the Commission: their occupation or vocation brought them daily into contact with marriage failures, and millions of happy unions did not come directly across their path. The *Royal Commission* repeatedly and publicly asked for concrete cases of hardship and only 350 were brought to its notice,¹⁶ a fact that is inconsistent with the supposed public demand for increased divorce facilities. "... apart from such changes as may bring within the reach of all the remedies which the law provides for all, there is no effective demand that divorce should be made easier."¹⁷ All laws occasionally fall heavily on individuals. They are made for the public good and the hardest cases must be tolerated rather than cut away one of the

¹⁴ *Minority Report*, p. 185.

¹⁵ *Minority Report*, p. 188.

¹⁶ *Minority Report*, p. 179.

¹⁷ *ibid.*, 180.

foundations on which the common good rests. The law cannot be changed to suit the needs of individuals; otherwise the principle would have to apply to the rest of the decalogue and, I imagine, few would contemplate permitting murder or suicide in the hard cases of individuals dying in misery and suffering. Hard cases, doubtless, exist in a progressive and modern State, such as Italy, which tolerates no divorce law; doubtless, also, there exists a demand on the part of the few for relief; but the people as a whole are satisfied with the existing law. The impression, perhaps, exists that this is the situation in Italy because its government is under the heel of the Pope. As a matter of fact, divorce facilities were resisted by the Italian Government, long before the Lateran Treaty, because the strength of the Italian nation was rightly considered to lie in the strength of family life. The indissolubility of marriage is defended with the same enthusiasm that the integrity of the State is defended, for the first is seen to be closely knit to the second.¹⁸

IV.

If this measure is passed, its provisions will fall heavily on Catholics and others who, for reasons of conscience, are unable to profit by the relief offered, especially when the woman is in question. They will be liable to having their marriages declared divorced or null, which are in conscience, before God, existing and valid. The terms of Clause 4, permitting the Court to refuse a separation and decree a divorce instead, will prevent many from seeking the relief of separation to which they are legally entitled. On this important point one of the nine majority commissioners, Mrs. H. J. Tennant, made a special statement: "I cannot feel that the guilty party should have any power to impose upon the innocent a remedy against which he or she may have conscientious objections."¹⁹ The point is distinctly one on which individuals have a right to be protected.

"One of the strongest reasons for not allowing *desertion* and *cruelty* as good causes of divorce is the ease with which they may be utilized for the dissolution

¹⁸ Cf. *Documentation Catholique*, *ib.*, p. 635.

¹⁹ *Majority Report*, p. 169.

of marriages of which the parties have simply grown tired, and mutually desire the end."²⁰ So great an authority as Lord Merrivale, writing in *The Times* of December 6th, 1933, states that persistent cruelty hardly ever takes place without adultery, and that "there is no plea which people have been more ingenious in fabricating than that of cruelty rendering cohabitation unsafe."

The majority of the experts on mental disease, who gave evidence before the Commission, were decidedly opposed to the proposal to make *insanity* a ground for divorce.²¹ The adoption of such a proposal would retard the recovery of the curable and help to upset the balance of some who are liable to this disease. "... It is doubtful whether, in these modern times, you can frequently say that an insane person is beyond recovery; and in an ordinary contract (to which marriage in other respects cannot be compared) there would be great difficulty in arranging a condition that it should be broken by the insanity of one of the signatories."²²

With regard to *drunkenness*: "We regard the present time, when there are hopeful signs that drunkenness, viewed as a disease, is likely to become amenable to treatment, as a peculiarly unsuitable one for stamping it with the finality and irreparableness implied in making it a ground for the dissolution of marriage."²³ Concerning a *life sentence* of imprisonment as an added cause of divorce, Lord Merrivale asserts that there is a large body of evidence that the attitude of the wife in such circumstances is commonly one of pity for her husband. "It is a very broad question: so broad that when, after due consideration of the complexities, you have formed an opinion, that opinion is likely as not to be wrong." What did strike the Minority Commissioners, in these and other suggestions, was the absence of all finality in them and the lack of any reasonable principle which can be set up as a guiding rule. *Incompatibility of temper* and *mutual consent* are not recommended as grounds for divorce, "not because they violate any

²⁰ *Minority Report*, p. 185.

²¹ *Minority Report*, p. 182.

²² Lord Merrivale, *ibid.*

²³ *Minority Report*, p. 183.

principle on which the Majority Report is based, but merely because, for the moment, no effective demand for them can be discerned."²⁴ In these words may be summed up the chief objection to the proposed measure. We are entitled to ask where the process is going to end, and what is to become of the institution of marriage if, each year or so, some new measure is introduced widening the grounds of divorce.

Criticism of the *nullity causes* in Clause 5 is largely covered by what has been already said. It is not within the competence of the State to erect new causes of nullity. The Clause contains an important *section (a)*, making a marriage voidable on the ground that it has not been consummated, owing to the wilful refusal of the respondent to consummate the marriage. It touches also on *desertion* as a cause of divorce in Clause 1, which is interpreted in Clause 10 to include "wilful and persistent refusal to permit marital intercourse." "Consummation of marriage" and "marital intercourse" will need definition by the legislature. It will have to be settled whether the use of contraceptives is to be regarded as marital intercourse and consummation. In the teaching of the Church such intercourse is not consummation of marriage and is gravely sinful and, unless the terms are to be taken in the Catholic sense, it will become possible for a decent clean living woman to be divorced on the ground of desertion owing to a refusal to commit what is rightly regarded as a grave sin.

The proposed Bill appears to offer no really effective remedies against collusion. Wider divorce facilities should be accompanied by sterner measures against attempting to secure divorce on fictitious and artificial grounds. As Lord Merrivale says, this is what is plainly required in the administration of justice in matrimonial causes. He also desires some better means of emphasizing that the guilty respondent has committed a serious offence. One effective remedy would be to prohibit the intermarriage of the guilty parties in adultery. The point was before the Commission, but it was decided to recommend no change in the existing law. It may be noted, in passing, that adultery with

²⁴ *Minority Report*, p. 184.

a pr
Cane
On
in P
the
will
the
the
again
They
appe
well
mini
best
for
meas

a promise of marriage is a diriment impediment in Canon Law.

On the last occasion when a Divorce Bill was debated in Parliament, Dr. O'Donovan was still speaking when the House was counted out. We may hope this speech will be continued when Mr. Holford Knight introduces the new *Matrimonial Causes Bill*. Catholic speakers in the past have sometimes adopted the line of speaking against the measure in general and voting against it. They will know the best tactics to employ, but it would appear that Catholic Members of Parliament would do well to criticize the Clauses in detail, with a view to minimizing their evil. But, having done this, to the best of their power, it remains nevertheless unlawful for them to vote even for a minimized and reduced measure of divorce.

THE LUTHERAN SOURCE OF THE ANGLICAN ORDINAL

BY THE REV. E. C. MESSENGER, Ph.D.

(First Article.)

THE recent "recognition" accorded to Anglican Orders by some of the schismatic Greek Patriarchs, and by the "Old Catholics," has begun to focus public attention once more upon this time-worn subject. For Catholics, of course, the question is a *res definita*, for Leo XIII settled the question once and for all so far as we are concerned. But there are many earnest Anglicans who are wistfully turning towards Rome, and these are occasionally repelled by what seems to them to be an unnecessarily harsh and severe attitude towards their "Orders." And, in any case, it is advisable to bring to their notice, not only the Papal decision, but also the reasonableness of it. In this series of articles I propose to develop a line of argument which has been strangely neglected by Catholics in the past, based as it is upon facts which have, quite naturally, not been proclaimed from the housetops by those few Anglicans who are aware of them. I propose, that is, to prove definitely that the Anglican Ordination rite of 1550, drawn up by Cranmer and his associates was modelled upon a Lutheran rite, and follows this very closely indeed.

The particular Lutheran rite we are here referring to is one drawn up by Martin Bucer, the famous German Protestant, who, having been for many years in friendly correspondence with Cranmer came over to England in 1549 at the Archbishop's invitation, when the Emperor's enforcement of the Interim of Augsburg made it impossible for him (Bucer) to continue to act as the Superintendent of his Reformed Church at Strasburg.

Bucer reached England on April 25th, 1549, and was for several months the guest of Archbishop Cranmer, first at Lambeth Palace, and then at the Archbishop's summer residence at Croydon. In the autumn of 1549,

Bucer was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge. Illness, and the death of his fellow Reformer Fagius, made it impossible for him to go to Cambridge until after November 13th. At Cambridge he again fell ill. However, he commenced lecturing in his house by Christmas, 1549, and on January 7th began his public lectures.

Bucer had always been a voluminous writer, and when he reached Cambridge he began his best known work, *De Regno Christi*, intended for King Edward VI.¹ Illness, however, interrupted its composition, and it was not sent off to the King until October 21st, 1550.

While at Cambridge, Bucer was asked to write a detailed criticism of the First Edwardine Prayer Book, and this he did in his famous *Censura*, which was addressed and sent off to the Bishop of Ely, though doubtless intended eventually for the Archbishop of Canterbury. Bucer's suggestions, as is well known, were for the most part carried out, and the Second Prayer Book was an even more pronouncedly Protestant work than the First had been. However, Bucer did not live to see the fruit of his suggestions in this respect, for he fell ill at Cambridge and died there on the 27th February, 1551. He was buried in the University Church of St. Mary. A great concourse of three thousand people attended his funeral, and a panegyric on him was preached by his great friend, Matthew Parker, subsequently Archbishop of Canterbury in Elizabeth's reign. In 1556, under Cardinal Pole, his body, and that of his fellow-Reformer Fagius, was burnt, but in 1560 they were solemnly replaced in St. Mary's Church by Archbishop Parker, and Grindal, then Bishop of London.

Now, in addition to the two works above mentioned, and other writings which do not concern us, Bucer also composed a work known as *De Ordinatione Legitima*, and

¹ Gasquet and Bishop (p. 301, note) say this work "must have been written in the autumn of 1550." On the contrary, it must have been commenced in the winter of 1549, though presented to the King, as Gasquet and Bishop say, on October 21st, 1550. The proof of this is that Bucer expressly apologizes at the end for having taken so long a time over the writing of it, and intimates that he began it when he first went to Cambridge, i.e., in 1549.

it is with this that we are mainly concerned. Bucer's English writings, or rather the works he wrote while in England, were sent over to Hubert at Basle by Grindal, by then an Archbishop, and incorporated into a collection of works known as the *Scripta Anglicana* of Martin Bucer, published at Basle in 1577. It was originally intended to publish some nine further volumes, containing Bucer's other writings, but for some reason or other this was found to be impossible. In any case, the Editor in this particular volume published not only the "English" writings of Bucer, but also a certain number of works belonging to his Continental period. The German works, as distinct from the English ones, are marked by the Editor by an asterisk in the Table of Contents. There is no asterisk attached to the title of this work, *De Ordinatione Legitima*. We ask the reader to bear this carefully in mind, and also to reflect that as the Editor had received these manuscripts directly from Archbishop Grindal, it is hardly conceivable that he would have blundered and placed a *German* work among the *English* ones. We already have sufficient grounds for inferring, then, that this particular work, *De Ordinatione Legitima*, was written by Bucer *during his stay in England*. We shall have occasion to show later that this inference is fully confirmed by internal evidence.

Now this particular work, of Bucer's *De Ordinatione Legitima*, contains a very interesting Ordination rite in Latin, and we propose to discuss its relation to the Ordination Service as drawn up by Cranmer in the reign of King Edward the Sixth.

The similarities between these two rites are so obvious that it is quite evident that they are related in some way or other. Let us see what suggestions have been made on this point.

The first person to refer to this Ordination rite of Bucer's seems to have been the famous Père Courayer, who wrote a *Dissertation sur la Validité des Ordinations Anglicanes* in 1724, duly translated into English by an Anglican. This work was violently attacked by several Catholic writers, amongst others, by Le Quien, and Père Hardouin. Accordingly in 1725, Courayer returned to the charge with a *Défense de la Dissertation*, and it is in this work that we find the first reference to Bucer.

Courayer's critics had suggested that the Anglican Prayer Book was a Calvinistic production. In reply, Courayer argues that Calvin had no hand in the composition of the Ordinal. He then continues (I quote from the English translation):

But some perhaps believe that Martyr and Bucer were substituted for him (Calvin), and that the Commissioners appointed to revise the Ordinal took the plan of their reformation from him. This, however, is neither true nor probable. . . . We find among Bucer's works a formulary of Ordination which he had drawn up for the Church of Strassburg. The very reading of this formulary is the most demonstrative proof that neither he nor his friend Martyr had any share in that of Edward. *Their prayers, as well as their ceremonies, are very different.* . . . (Vol. II, pp. 205, 207).²

I have not been able to trace the reason for this mention of Bucer's rite. Neither Le Quien nor Hardouin seem to have brought it forward. Perhaps Le Courayer derived his information from one of his Anglican friends. For his own sake we must charitably hope that this is the case, as otherwise we must say, with one of his Anglican critics (the Rev. R. Travers Smith, *vide infra*), that his treatment of Bucer is "singularly uncandid," inasmuch as there is the *greatest possible resemblance* between the prayers of the two rites. Le Courayer is, however, on safer ground when he says that Bucer's rite was drawn up for the Church at Strasburg. We shall see later that this is substantially correct.

The next reference to Bucer is apparently Archbishop Laurence,³ but he contents himself with saying that the German reformer was not the author of the Baptismal Service in the Anglican Prayer Book, and quotes (for the first time) from Beza a letter of Bucer's to which we shall have occasion to refer later. About Bucer's relation to the Ordinal the Archbishop is silent.

We come now to the year 1872, and the Rev. R. Travers Smith, a clergyman of the Church of Ireland. A proposal was on foot for the revision of the Anglican Ordinal in a still more Protestant direction, and this clergyman replies in a book called *We Ought Not to*

² Italics mine unless otherwise mentioned.

³ Bampton Lectures, 1820 edition, p. 253-4.

Alter the Ordinal (Dublin, 1872). In an important Appendix he writes as follows:—

It seems difficult to imagine that the following document should have escaped the notice of our ecclesiastical historians and commentators on the Prayer Book. . . . After diligent search through all the ordinary works of this nature I could not find the slightest notice of it in any of them. . . . It is referred to by Courayer . . . but Courayer, if he ever read the form throughout, gives an extremely uncandid account of it, for he says that the prayers bear no resemblance to those in the English Ordinal. . . . In the very same year in which Bucer arrived in England, the Ordinal was under consideration. . . . I suppose the Ordinal of Bucer to have been written as a suggestion for the Committee, or for Cranmer, who took the chief part in its proceedings. Courayer, indeed, deems it to have been written for the Church at Strasburg, and it would make a little difference if this were thought to be the case. But there seem to be many reasons for rejecting this theory. The Ordinal stands in a treatise *De Ordinatione Legitima . . . revocanda*, which begins "*Quaeritur de ordinatione legitima revocanda. . . .*" And again in the contents of the volume . . . an asterisk is fixed to the title of all the works written originally in Germany. . . . Moreover, I am not aware that any of the foreign Protestant bodies the three "orders" which Bucer mentions ever existed. He himself, in a work which was originally written for Strasburg, gives the usual Presbyterian account of the ministry (*Scripta Anglicana*, p. 231). . . . The final portion of his work reads exactly like a suggestion to a Committee. . . . If it be in any way an account of the custom of ordinations at Strasburg (and a few passages *do* read as if they were stating the custom of a church), it is an account drawn up and adapted as a suggestion for England. The "*nostrae Ecclesiae*" of p. 120 may be and no doubt are the churches of the Continent. But the *Ratio Ordinandi* which follows is not anything ever literally used in those churches, but the form which Bucer suggests to the English Church as one which would preserve the things which these churches deemed essential.

The author then gives Bucer's rite and that of the Prayer Book in parallel columns, and concludes:

There can be no doubt that Bucer's form is the original of a great deal of our English Ordinal. *The coincidences are too many and striking to admit any question as to the relationship of the forms*, and neither do the events of Bucer's life show any period when he could have composed an Ordinal founded on the English one, nor is there any original source from which they could both have drawn. The work cannot possibly have been a proposed substitute for the English one composed after that had been issued. For

when Bucer did compose observations upon the Prayer Book they were direct criticisms quite different in form and manner from this work, and it would not have been possible that he should have proposed a substitute for the English Ordinal without mentioning or alluding to his reasons for dissatisfaction with it. Besides, the diffuseness and indecision of much of his work in comparison with the English forbids us to suppose that it was founded on the latter (pp. 145, et seq.).

The next reference to the subject is in an unsigned and presumably Editorial article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January, 1878. We quote the following extracts :

The most cursory perusal of this work (of Bucer's) will prove its relationship to our Ordinal. The selections of Scripture to be read are very nearly identical with those used in our three forms. The beautiful exhortation in our Ordinal of Priests stands unmistakably, though in a poor Latin style, in Bucer's work. The questions put to the ordinands are in many cases identical, and of many of the prayers the same may be said . . . (p. 238).

Regarding this work, only two theories are possible. Either it was the Ordinal of 1549 translated into Latin (as the Prayer Book was) for the information of Bucer, who did not know English, and by him altered and welded into one form and proposed as a "reduction of episcopacy" for the revision of 1552, or else it was an original draft for the Ordinal of 1549; either drawn up by Bucer himself as an account of the arrangements in his church of Strasburg and proposed as a model for England, or an alteration by him of some draft by Cranmer or some other of the Committee. Various indications, which we have not space to recount, incline us to the first form of the latter alternative. We hold that the document was a draft for the Ordinal of 1549, and moreover that it was the original work of Bucer itself (p. 270).

The following sentence is also worth quoting from the same source :

We should advise nobody to study the real history of this matter who has not nerve enough to recognize how close the Church of England lay in those days to mere Protestantism (p. 269).

The next reference is in the Latin work, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, by Denny and Lacey, published in 1895, with a Preface by Bishop Worsworth, of Salisbury. The aim of this work was to present a reasoned defence of Anglican Orders for consideration by Continental theo-

logians, and it was in point of fact largely instrumental in promoting the discussion which culminated in the Roman Commission of 1896 and Leo XIII's Bull *Apostolicae Curae*. These authors allowed that Cranmer and his colleagues had Bucer's rite before them, but maintain that they deliberately rejected it:

The revisers of the Anglican rite, who paid great deference to the authority of Bucer, had this book in their hands, but resisted his counsels. They drew up a Rite *altogether opposed to Bucer's*, and the motive which they assigned for their undertaking was equally alien from his (p. 139).

The explanation of this last sentence is found in the following:

Bucer did not seek to retain the sacred ministry of the Church, the priesthood, and the episcopate, but dreamed of some sort of Apostolic ordinations, long since disused, and wished to have them restored (p. 139).

But as to the Anglicans:

Theirs was no intention to restore a legitimate ordination of ministers supposed to have lapsed during unhappy times, but to preserve for posterity Sacred Orders which had always been in use in the Church. They provided different rites of ordering for the different grades of the Hierarchy. They did not retain Bucer's single form, but assigned a distinct form for each order. . . . What was their object in all this? Clearly it was, while rejecting Lutheran and other heretical views on the sacred ministry, to retain the true priesthood of the Church and preserve it by a valid rite.

Bucer's work was next⁴ treated by Father Sidney

⁴ Bucer's rite seems to have received very inadequate consideration from previous Catholic writers. Estcourt (*Anglican Ordinations*, p. 26), writing in 1873, says that Bucer drew up his rite as a proposed revision of the First Ordinal, for the Second Prayer Book, and that "it seems to have met with no attention."

In 1894, "Dalbus," i.e., the Abbé Portal, allowed that Bucer was prior to the First Ordinal, and that the two rites were in some respects similar, but stressed the fact that the Anglican Reformers expanded the single rite into three separate ones for the three orders, and concluded:

"The compilers, therefore, deliberately rejected the suggestions of Bucer, so as to keep faithfully to the traditional teaching of the distinction of the orders, and of their sacramental validity" (*Les Ordinations Anglicanes*, p. 24).

But the Abbé Portal is here basing himself entirely upon the *Church Quarterly Review* article to which we have already alluded.

Smith, S.J., in two articles in the *Tablet* for January 11th and 18th, 1896. In these he set quotations from the two rites side by side, and maintained that the Anglican rite was substantially copied from that of Bucer. He was immediately taken to task, however, by Canon Lacey, who urged that his theory was disproved completely in view of the fact that Bucer wrote to a friend in January, 1550, "when the Ordinal was certainly ready," to say that no foreigner had been consulted in the matter of Anglican rites.⁵

What then was Bucer's draft? I conclude that it was a proposed revision of the English Ordinal. It may very possibly have been written before the Ordinal was actually in use, but it was founded upon it. Bucer's object was to bring the English Ordinal into harmony with Lutheran conceptions. . . . *It was not Cranmer who borrowed from Bucer, but Bucer who borrowed from Cranmer* (Letter to *Tablet*, February 1st, 1896).

In reply to this, Fr. Sidney Smith allowed that Bucer's rite might be posterior to the English Ordinal, though he considered internal evidence to be against it, and went on to say that he found it "increasingly difficult to believe that Bucer's rite was correctly placed among his Anglican writings. . . . The document smacks of Germany rather than of England." He also pointed out that Bucer's letter was not conclusive. But, to this last point, we ourselves shall return later.

Canon Lacey, then, had changed his views, and the change was duly notified in the *Supplementum De Hierarchia Anglicana*, written in Rome in 1896. Here he maintained (wrongly) that Bucer did not arrive in England till June, 1549, that the new Anglican Ordinal was ready in October of the same year (also incorrect), and that accordingly, Bucer had no time to compose the rite (*non sequitur*).

In 1897, the Rev. Dr. Moberly, in his work *Ministerial Priesthood*, referred to Bucer's rite, as follows:

It is well known how great and how injurious an influence was exercised at this time by Bucer in England, and especially upon the revision of the Prayer Book of 1552. In the Ordinal itself, *as published with that book*, there are traces of him, for which we have little cause to be grateful. But these facts, however painful in themselves, only bring out into sharper relief the clear decision with which in their

⁵ We deal with this letter later.

official work, these divines, although led by Cranmer and perilously exposed to the influence of Bucer, yet resisted the Bucerian pressure (p. 236).

And in proof of the last mentioned point, Dr. Moberly appeals to the language of the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal. We note, in passing, that Dr. Moberly apparently regarded Bucer's rite as composed *after* the First Ordinal (1550) but *before* the Second (1552), which would approximate to the view expressed by Canon Lacey.

Canon Lacey's colleague, the Rev. E. Denny, expressed himself as follows in his brochure *The English Church and the Ministry of the Reformed Churches* (1900):

It is clear that either (1) the compilers of the Ordinal had before them Bucer's draft service, in which case it would follow that they deliberately rejected his proposed form of ordination, and his avowed intention in compiling it, or else (2) Bucer's draft represents a revision of the Ordinal made by himself with the object of bringing it into harmony with the idea embodied in the title of his compilation. The latter seems to be the more probable conclusion, but whichever view is taken of the relation of Bucer's draft to the Ordinal it is clear that the latter is in direct opposition to the conception of the ministry held by foreign Reformers.

And, in confirmation, Mr. Denny, like Canon Lacey, appeals to Bucer's letter, with which we shall deal in due course.

Coming now to more recent years,⁶ Dr. Frere, now Bishop of Truro, in his revision of Procter's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*,⁷ allows that in the compiling of the Anglican Ordinal, "considerable use was made of a scheme of Bucer, but his doctrinal innovations were rejected" (p. 62). And again:

The Revisers had before them a draft of Ordination Services drawn up by Martin Bucer, probably for their special benefit. While they rejected Bucer's doctrinal standpoint, they accepted much of his plan, and drew largely upon him for the exhortations and examinations. . . . But here the similarity ends, and when the more crucial parts of the service are reached there is no sign of Bucer's influence (pp. 662-665).

⁶ In 1892, a study of the Lutheran Movement in England was written by H. E. Jacobs, but though he mentions the Lutheran influence on practically all the other rites, he is entirely silent about the Anglican Ordinal. Similarly, I have found no reference to the subject in Dixon's *History of the Church of England*.

⁷ 1900, and many subsequent editions up to 1925.

The great Dr. Brightman, in his work on *The English Rite* (2 vols., 1915), takes it for granted that the Anglican rite is modelled upon Bucer.

He (Bucer) was Cranmer's guest for three months, and no doubt it was during these months that he wrote the "De Ordinatione," in view of the English forms of Ordination, which must have been already in Cranmer's mind.

The collective volume published last year by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, *Liturgy and Worship*, is interesting inasmuch as two divergent opinions are included. The "History of the Book of Common Prayer" is by Dr. Brightman, who allows that

Bucer's order suggested the Introits, Epistles and Gospels of the ordination of priests and bishops, three of the questions in the scrutiny of deacons, and three in that of bishops, the allocution to priests, and the prayer of their Ordination (p. 171).

But on the other hand, Dr. Firminger writes as follows in the section on "The Ordinal":

The passages of Bucer which Dr. Frere thinks influenced the compilers (of the Ordinal) are Latin translations of the first Edwardine Ordinal, and not a draft which lay before the compilers of the First Ordinal (p. 672).

Bucer's draft was tendered as a revision of the First Edwardian rite for the ordering of priests, altered so as to make it available for the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons (*ibid.*, footnote).

On the other hand, Bucer's rite is duly dealt with by the Rev. Charles Smythe, M.A., sometime Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, in his Hulsean Prize Essay on *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* (Cambridge University Press, 1926). He says (p. 229) that "It is *almost certain* that the function of the Commission (which was appointed to draw up the Anglican Ordinal) was not to 'devise' a new Ordinal, but to accept or suggest improvements to one that had already been drawn up, presumably by Cranmer and Ridley, on the basis of a draft made by Martin Bucer." He goes on to say that this "draft" was "probably written while Bucer was at Croydon (May-June, 1549)." But he thinks there is an "important difference" between the "draft" and the Anglican Ordinal, because Bucer "recognizes only two distinct orders in the Church." (We shall see later that this is incorrect.) Also, the "essential forms" for

the three orders in the Anglican rite are different from Bucer's single form, "but in almost every other respect the form of ordering priests is closely modelled upon Bucer's Ordinal." Mr. Smythe says nothing about the use of the rite at Strasburg, and indeed seems to think it was drawn up specially for Cranmer. This is incorrect, as we shall see.

As to other authorities, Mr. Eels, in his recent study of Bucer published in America, says that Bucer "perhaps" influenced the Anglican Ordinal. He refers to a work by A. E. Harvey on *Bucer in England* (Marburg, 1906) which I have unfortunately been unable to consult.⁸ A Swiss Protestant Pastor has this year published a thesis (for the University of Strasburg) on "La Notion d'Eglise chez Bucer," but he does not discuss Bucer's Ordination rite—a surprising omission.

The preceding quotations will serve at least to show the interest which has been aroused by this Bucerian Ordination rite, and the number of theories which have been suggested concerning it. We propose in the next articles to print the Bucerian and Anglican rites side by side. We will then outline the evidence which, in our opinion, proves quite conclusively that *Cranmer definitely copied from Bucer*. A further article will deal with the doctrinal position of Bucer, with a view to seeing whether there was any real difference between Cranmer and himself. We shall then be in a position to consider the significance of the Anglican variations from Bucer's rite. We shall conclude that there was *no real difference between Cranmer and Bucer*, and that accordingly, the Anglican Ordination rite must for this reason be regarded as invalid from the Catholic point of view, just as are the group of Lutheran ordination rites, *to which group the Anglican rite quite definitely belongs*.

(To be continued.)

⁸ Since writing the above, I have been able to consult Harvey's work, through the kindness of the Rev. C. Smythe, who possesses what is probably the only copy of the book in this country. Harvey says it is "not improbable that this work was composed at the wish of Cranmer, who already in 1549, when Bucer was with him, had the design of publishing an Ordination rite. . . . At any rate it provided the basis for the ordination rite arranged for in the Parliament of 25th January, 1550. . . . If we compare the Ordinal of 1550 with the work of Bucer we see that they are so similar that it is clear that the former is influenced by the latter" (pp. 57-8).

C
T
prom
Chur
of So
Baco
atter
cribe
Nor
mona
man
treas
I s
Lenin
as a
actual
Social
The
on pr
the p
thetic
philos
inform
are st
in ma
to Co
Comm
is not
and
It doe
repud
fessor
Marx
of Our

COMMUNISM AND THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL PROGRAMME

BY THE REV. LEWIS WATT, S.J., B.Sc.(Econ.).

THE purpose of this paper is to discuss Communism in its modern (i.e., Marxist) form, and to show that it offers us nothing in the way of a programme of social reform which is better, sounder or more promising than the social programme of the Catholic Church. I shall make no attempt to trace the history of Socialist Utopias, such as those of B. Thomas More, Bacon, Campanella, Fourier and St. Simon; or of the attempts to found Communist colonies such as those described by Gide (*Co-operative and Communist Colonies*). Nor do I think it necessary to say anything about monastic Communism, the motive of which is to regulate man's acquisitive instincts and to help him to put his treasure in Heaven that his heart may be there also.

I shall deal with the Communism of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, which has established itself not only as a philosophy opposed to Christianity, but also as an actual political and social system in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

There is an enormous output of literature in English on present-day Russia, and, to a rather less extent, on the philosophy of Communism. Most of this is sympathetic to the Russian experiment and even to its philosophy, though we are not without books by well-informed authors (such as Gurian and Berdiaeff) who are strongly critical of Communism. A certain difficulty in making use of even those books which are sympathetic to Communism is caused by the fact that the official Communist Party is reluctant to admit that anyone who is not a member of that Party can avoid misstatements and misrepresentation when writing about Marxism. It does not approve of Professor Laski's exposition; it repudiates Mr. Middleton Murry; and it sneers at Professor Hook's recent *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx*. Moreover, as Berdiaeff has explained (*The End of Our Time*), the "general line" of the Soviet philosophy

is now the official monopoly of the Institute of Red Professors at Moscow, which is by no means content to accept all the interpretations of Marx-Leninist philosophy which professed Bolsheviks put forth. For example, Bukharin, the theorist of historical materialism, has now been thrown over.

But most of the difficulties connected with getting an authoritative statement of the official Communist philosophy turn on the meaning of the Marxist "dialectic"; and on less metaphysical questions it is possible to state with some hope of accuracy what the Communist position is.

To begin with the institution of private property, it is rather easy for us, for whom the idea of Communism has long been associated with the religious vow of poverty, to misunderstand the place which theories about property hold in Marxist Communism. It would be true to say that the theory of property is subsidiary, in Marxism, to the theory of class. Religious Communism has as its motive an ascetic ideal. It is the form assumed by a life of voluntary poverty lived by a group of men or women. But Marxist Communism has no such ascetic ideal.

" 'Some comrades say a Communist should not have a house of his own, nor a bicycle, nor two suits of clothes,' wrote one, 'but are we an order of begging friars, or monks, who believe in having nothing? We aren't fighting for a condition in which everyone shall be poor. Our aim is to make life better for everyone, not worse. If a man has two suits of clothes and can change into clean clothes after work, so much the better.' " So says Miss Ella Winter, in *Red Virtue* (1933). She continues: "That this point of view is shared by other Communists, I learned from my own experience."

There can be no doubt that this correctly expresses Marx's attitude. He is not opposed to private property because of the danger that men may become so attached to what they possess as to endanger their spiritual welfare. He is opposed to it in so far as it enables one class, the property-owners, to oppress and exploit the class which owns no property, the proletariat. And since it is chiefly the ownership of *productive* property which gives economic and political power, it is to the private

ownership of *the means of production* that Marxism is opposed. So we read in the Programme of the Comintern : "The characteristic features of capitalist society . . . are the monopoly of the most important and vital means of production by the capitalist class and the big landlords; the exploitation of the wage-labour of the proletariat, which, being deprived of the means of production, is compelled to sell its labour-power; the production of commodities for profit; and . . . the planless and anarchic character of the process of production as a whole. Exploitation relationships and the economic domination of the bourgeoisie find their political expression in the organized Capitalist State."

The Communist remedy—the transference of the ownership of the means of production from private owners to society as a whole—is intended as a means to put an end to the exploitation of one class by another.

There is, therefore, no theoretical hostility to the private ownership of articles intended for the use and enjoyment of the owner; a fact which immediately differentiates Marxist Communism from religious Communism. In practice, the accumulation of articles of use is strictly limited by the policy of the Soviets. A young German, well acquainted with Russia and having many friends there, thus describes the condition of things which he found in that country on a recent visit : "In the Soviet State a distinction is made between property in the form of means of production, and that in the form of articles of use. Property in the form of land, of industrial or commercial undertakings, of mineral wealth, is consistently fought against; in part it has already been eliminated; what remains of it—especially in rural districts—is, in part, in process of liquidation. Re-acquisition seems out of the question. On the other hand, everybody has unrestricted right of possession as regards daily use; provisions, clothing, books, radio-sets."¹ But, as Herr Mehnert admits, the shortage of practically all articles of use makes the unrestricted right to possess them illusory. Moreover, while the working-class can (so far as the shortage of commodities permits) obtain the necessities of life at low

¹ *Youth in Soviet Russia*, by Klaus Mehnert. English translation 1933, from the German edition 1932.

prices, though in small quantities, at the "co-operatives" on the production of ration cards, everything beyond this minimum necessary for existence must be bought at high prices either in the State shops or from the few remaining private traders. If one wishes to save in the hope of better times, one is confronted with the further inconvenience that there are frequently recurring borrowings by the State: and that to lend to the State is, owing to social pressure, practically compulsory. Saving is further discouraged by the fear that the State may any day decide to confiscate all accumulations of wealth in the hands of individuals.²

That the general shortage of articles for consumption is not entirely unconnected with the Communist attitude to property, and in particular with its attitude to the profit-motive, seems clear from the fact that the Soviet Government has had to abandon its attempt to fix wage-rates independently of the work done by the wage-earners. It was soon discovered that even in Russia one cannot entirely ignore the stimulus to production which is given by differential rewards to the workers according to the work they do. As one of Herr Mehnert's Communist friends said to him when he paid a visit to Russia at the end of 1932, "You can't ask people to pump the last ounce out of themselves day and night, and bear the heaviest responsibilities, if you don't simultaneously ease the external circumstances of their life; if you don't pay them the wages they have really earned by hard work . . . You should have been there when we re-introduced and graded the piece-work rates in our factory a year ago! Who d'you suppose was against piece-work rates and for levelling? The unqualified 'black' workers who had come from their village to the town a few weeks or a month before . . . and on the other hand the best people were running away from us because we didn't pay them appropriate wages. All that's different now. The unskilled worker goes at the work with a crash and tries to increase his qualifications as quickly as possible, in order to climb a few rungs higher up the ladder of the piece-rates; the qualified man has no more cause to go on the tramp, because he's properly paid and preferentially treated."

² Mehnert, *op. cit.*

The experience of the Soviet authorities in their dealings with the peasants has been similar to that which they had when handling the problem of the wages of the proletariat. Mr. John Morgan, one of twelve members of the British Labour Movement who visited Russia in the summer of 1932, and who recorded their impressions in *Twelve Studies in Soviet Russia*, gives a very unfavourable account of the Agricultural Front there, an account which has aroused the ire of our British Communists. One of his remarks about the Russian peasant is, "Produce uncertainty in his mind as to whose the crop is to be, and he'll not bother so much about the sowing of the next until he's more sure of his position in regard to it."

Human nature has proved itself exceedingly recalcitrant to the Communist policy of eliminating the profit-motive. No doubt the motive of profit-making has often led, does often lead, to avarice and to the exploitation of others. No doubt the motive of serving the community is by no means as widespread in "capitalist" countries as Catholic morality requires it to be. But even those (non-Communists) who have most earnestly proclaimed the duty of Service are coming to see that this duty does not exclude a reasonable desire to serve oneself and one's family. As Pius XI has said, "Those who are engaged in production are not forbidden to increase their possessions in a just and lawful way; indeed, it is right that he who renders service to society and enriches it should himself have his due share of the increased wealth of the community" (*Quadragesimo Anno*). And this is true both of wage-earners and of capitalists. The experience of Russia shows that to neglect the value of the contribution made to production and to attempt to force people to work for the community from the sole motive of "service" is not merely unjust but impracticable. The problem of reconciling the natural and reasonable desire to promote one's own welfare with the undoubted duty to promote the welfare of the community is not to be solved by the naïve method of suppressing one of the factors in the problem.

In endeavouring to dispense with the motive of personal advantage and to abolish payment of wages by results, the Soviet authorities were really going beyond their Marxist brief. According to Marxist theory, it is

only in the final phase of Communism that distribution is to be according to needs and not according to the value of work done. At present Russia is in the so-called "transitional" stage, between capitalism and perfect Communism, and at that stage Marxism holds remuneration should correspond to work done. The Utopian belief that the motive of personal advantage will cease to affect the citizens of a truly Communist society is founded upon the theory that Communism will ultimately result in such an identification of the individual with the group as to change human psychology as all history has shown it to be. The dislike shown by Marxism for the profit-motive arises from the desire, already mentioned, to abolish exploitation of one class by another. Not only do class-distinctions tend to arise from distinctions in wealth, but sooner or later one may expect the richer class or classes to claim the right to accumulate, even to invest, what they do not require for their personal needs. In other words, personal property in productive goods, after having been thrown out of the door by "socialization," comes back through the window. And for Marxists the prime cause of exploitation is private ownership of productive goods.

Here again Catholic social theory is far more profound in its analysis and far more realist in its programme than Communism. Large-scale private ownership of productive goods (large-scale being relative to the amount of any particular type of productive goods in existence) gives great economic power to the owners. No one would deny that the temptation to abuse power is always present, but it does not follow that the only corrective is to take away the source of the power. There may be good social reasons for leaving the power with those who have it, but taking steps to prevent its abuse. Nor is there any reason to accept the dogma that private ownership of productive goods, even on a small-scale, is necessarily a source of exploitation. Catholic social theory maintains that the private ownership of productive goods is in entire accordance with human nature and its needs, that in itself it is socially more desirable than State ownership; but that it may rightly be controlled by the State if it shows signs of becoming anti-social. If no control would suffice in a particular case, nationalization may be resorted to. "It is rightly contended," writes Pius XI, "that certain

forms of property must be reserved to the State, since they carry with them an opportunity of domination too great to be left to private individuals without injury to the community at large" (*Quadragesimo Anno*). There is no space here to detail the whole Catholic philosophy of property as set out by the Pope. It must suffice to note that he is strongly insistent on the social obligations of property-owners, and that he rejects an individualist view of property as strongly as the collectivist or Marxist view. On these allied questions of property and the profit-motive, one may describe the error of Communism by the rather hackneyed but appropriate simile of the baby in the bath; Communism empties out the baby with the bath-water.

Associated with the Communist attack on private ownership of the means of production is its denunciation of the anarchy of production which, it claims, is a necessary consequence of capitalism. This charge was far truer when the economic theory of laissez-faire and free competition held sway than it is to-day. So long as you have a large number of independent and unassociated producers competing for a limited market and endeavouring to forecast the course of demand, you will have some anarchy in production, implying over-production of some commodities and under-production of others, with consequent waste and even industrial crises. *Laissez-faire* was the current economic theory when Marx was alive, and very naturally it affected his theories. But it no longer commands the minds and actions of producers as it did in the nineteenth century. The necessity for economic planning is on everybody's lips. The vital question is, who is to do the planning, and in whose interests? Communist theory replies that the State must do it in the interests of the proletariat. Catholic theory prefers that it should be done by each industry, internally organized for that and other purposes, under the general supervision of the State and for the benefit of the community as a whole. No one has spoken more strongly against political and economic laissez-faire than Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XI. With rational economic planning the Church has no quarrel; it is but the extension of the practical reason of man from the individual to the social sphere in economics, and the more rationally the world is organized the better the Church is pleased.

She most certainly is no friend of disorder and anarchy. Nevertheless, she perceives grave dangers both to liberty and to economic efficiency in the Communist theory that the planning should be done immediately and directly by the State. She holds that such work as this is outside the sphere of the State, and that the State not only has not the technical equipment for it, but will, in attempting to undertake it, be distracted from its proper function of governing. Once again we may note the Communist tendency to run to extremes; either *laissez-faire* and its anarchy of production, or State-planning of industry—these are the only alternatives it perceives. But they are not the only alternatives possible.

Before leaving this question of private ownership, it is worth while pointing out that Communism has found its theories impracticable in the matter of inheritance. In 1918 it was decreed that all property passed to the State when the owner died. Then a modification was introduced to exempt a maximum of 10,000 roubles from the operation of the decree. But in 1926 even this limit was dropped. Now the right both of intestate succession and of testamentary disposition are recognized by Soviet law.

The final phase of Communism, to which allusion has already been made, will (so runs the Marxist prophecy) be characterized by an absence of class-distinctions and of the State, "the organ of class-domination." No doubt class-distinctions may be, and have been, the sources of tyranny and exploitation, as is particularly obvious when they harden into caste-divisions as in India. No doubt, too, there is a tendency for class-distinction to be based upon the possession of wealth and of the power which accompanies wealth. Exploitation, tyranny and snobbery are all detestable; but that there will always be some distinction of classes in any society seems to me certain. The important thing seems to be that class-distinctions should be based on the differences in social functions performed by the citizens, on the importance to the community of the work done by a class; and that greater social distinction should be attached to a class in proportion as it gives greater social service for a smaller material reward. I do not believe that class-distinctions *as such* are resented by most people or that they necessarily lead to social friction and disunion. These evils arise only when a class loses the sense of its social responsibilities.

That the "liquidation" of one sort of class-distinction in Russia has been followed by the appearance of another is evident from a passage in Herr Mehnert's book :

That an *élite*, an aristocracy, exists in the Soviet Union is beyond all doubt, and no attempt whatever is made to deny it, even from the Russian side. It is to be met with everywhere. It includes the Komsomolites and members of the Party, Party and State officials, artists, the students and the proletarian experts and technicians they have produced, the shock-workers and the Red soldiers.

Let us, however, assume that classes will disappear in the final phase of Communism, or at any rate class-exploitation. Will it follow that the State will disappear, "wither away," since, in Lenin's words, the State is the product and the manifestation of the irreconcilability of class-antagonisms? It is difficult to be sure whether Communists are entirely in earnest when they write on this topic. No State, no police, no courts of justice, no army, no navy; the "armed nation" will punish malefactors. Here we see the anarchism which seems native to Russia. An English Communist has recently written: "In the sphere of capitalist anarchy, production, there will be complete order and plan; in the sphere of capitalist 'order,' political government, there will be complete anarchy. Communist society differs only from the ideal society of the sentimental anarchist in that it is based on the understanding that political anarchy must have as its basis the long development of man's productive powers and the social organization of production which alone makes possible the abolition of class divisions in society."³ All this political theory seems to me exceedingly vulnerable to criticism, all exceedingly unreal and impracticable, indeed self-contradictory. But is it seriously meant? Is it perhaps what the syndicalist Sorel used to call a "social myth," an impossible ideal intended to inspire effort; the carrot to be forever dangled before the donkey's nose? Lenin, at least, makes it clear that there is no certainty (notwithstanding the "dialectic") that the final phase of Communism will ever arrive; what is certain is that in the meantime there must be "the strictest control

³ Emile Burns: *Capitalism, Communism and the Transition*, p. 138, 1933.

by society and by the State of the quantity of labour and the quantity of consumption.⁴ Let anyone compare for himself these fanciful political imaginings with the doctrine of the State as set out by the Papal encyclicals, and it is impossible to believe that he will not see the incomparable superiority of the Catholic position.

Property and the profit-motive, class-distinctions and the State; on all these points we have seen Communism forced by experience to modify its principles and approach to the Catholic position, or, when experience has not yet been provided, venturing on a sort of social mythology which experience would soon prove to be mere phantasy-thinking. It has been as unlucky in its doctrinaire attitude to the family. We are all familiar with its attack on the institution of marriage, and its early insistence that the child belongs not to the parents but to the State. But the new generation of Communists is not satisfied, and some at least of the older generation perceive the threat to social order contained in the principles they used to accept. The central organ of the Komsomol (Communist Youth Association) has laid it down that "the only solution of the sex question is a firm and lasting marriage built on love, and such marriage can only result from reciprocal friendship, closeness of soul, and community of interests" (quoted both by Miss Winter and Herr Mehnert). Even Lenin's widow was constrained to protest against the proposals to take the child from its parents and educate it in children's towns. Herr Mehnert tells us that "the tenacity with which Russian women are resisting separation from their children is shown in innumerable descriptions and reports." Mrs. Cole, one of the twelve members of the British Labour Movement who visited Russia in 1932, says: "Russians I met declared very emphatically that family life, in any real sense, was not being destroyed, though they agreed that immediately after the Revolution there had been a tendency to throw it out of the window along with other bourgeois lumber." It would seem as though the old ideas were coming back, purified by their temporary exile from the stigma of being bourgeois.

I shall say little about the Communist attitude to

⁴ Lenin : *The State and Revolution*.

religion, for the Communist propaganda in favour of atheism is well known. It is, however, interesting to find such a sympathizer with Communism as Dr. Julius Hecker admitting that as late as December, 1932, the propaganda had had little effect in the collectivized villages, and that even in Moscow he found that most of the anti-religious books in the public libraries had not been read even once.⁵ He also mentions that it is the general complaint of atheist agitators that the Communist Youth Movement has alienated itself from the anti-religious propaganda. The more thoughtful amongst the Communist youth, he tells us, are beginning to ask the eternal questions of "whence" and "whither," and have not received satisfactory answers. The old anti-clerical agitation does not appeal to them any more, they desire something more constructive and interesting.

In so far as youth in any country is actively hostile to religion, it is usually because it has been taught that religion is merely the ally, or rather the instrument, of an exploiting class. The desire of youth for justice and fellowship between man and man is a noble thing, the sign of the naturally Christian soul. It is vital to the cause of Christ and His Church that we should never acquiesce in such a view of the Catholic Church as would make it appear that she condones injustice or oppression.

According to some writers, Communism has taken on the aspect of a religion. We are told that it inspires enthusiasm because it gives a "unified view of life." One end in view—the establishment of perfect Communism; one means to that end—the speedy industrialization of Russia. If this be true, it is pitiable. The end one which, on Lenin's own admission, may never be achieved; but even if it were, what then? What lasting satisfaction would there be for the human mind and heart in a form of living based upon materialism and repudiating the supreme importance of the spirit of man, denying God and the soul? And what a contradiction in terms, that materialism should be the foundation of youth's idealism!

The superiority of Christianity is here most evident. It sets before our eyes the ideal of the triumph of Christ

⁵ *Religion and Communism*, 1933.

in the souls of all men and in society. Pius XI has expressed the Christian ideal in his encyclical *Mens Nostra* (1930). Stirred by the example of Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life, the Christian is to "put off the old man," to deny himself, and with humility, obedience and voluntary mortification of self to put on Christ, striving to attain to the perfect man, to "the measure of age of the fullness of Christ." He is to strive to be able to say of himself: "I live now not I, but Christ liveth in me." The ideal, in other words, is not something negative: not self-denial for the sake of self-denial. It is a positive ideal, Christlikeness. Nor is it a purely individualist ideal; it has its social side. For, as the Pope remarks, to put on Christ is to be inspired with the apostolic spirit, "the desire to bring others to share in the knowledge and love of the Infinite Good." It is sometimes thought that this Christian ideal excludes all preoccupation with material conditions, with the machinery of economic and social life, and an attitude of indifference towards the political and civic affairs of one's country. Yet it is Pius XI himself who, in his encyclical on the Kingship of Christ, expressed his profound regret that Catholics do not play a larger and more active part in the public life of the world; and who, in his encyclical on the Social Order (*Quadragesimo Anno*), has summoned us all, all the faithful, to a crusade for the reconstruction of that order and for its perfection according to the precepts of the Gospel.

If we are to command the enthusiasm of Catholic youth, it is in this light that the Christian ideal must be presented to the world; not as a mere code of prohibitions for the restriction of those Catholics who accept the easy objectives (one can hardly call them ideals) of the world, but as an ideal calling for effort and self-sacrifice; the ideal of the victory of the Infinite Good, Christ, God and man, over every form of evil, every kind of injustice, both in the hearts of individuals and in their social and economic organization.

It is not open to us to deny, even if we wished to do so, that there are many evils and abuses in the social order. They have been pilloried by the Popes time after time. "Immense power and despotic economic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few. . . . The whole of economic life has become hard, cruel and

relentless in a ghastly measure. . . . Some have become so hardened against the stings of conscience as to hold all means good which enable them to increase their profits " and so on (*Quadragesimo Anno*).

It is useless and an offence against truth to meet Communism by the assertion that all is well under the present régime of Capitalism. We probably know of many in all classes who desire nothing more than to guide their lives by Christian principles; but the difficulty is that even such as these too often find themselves so enmeshed in the web of modern industrialism that they can see no choice between economic ruin and conformity to prevailing standards; and so reluctantly acquiesce in what they acknowledge to be wrong.

Yet, if we are to meet the Communist attack effectively, we must do more than lament the evils which we recognize. We must set ourselves to the task to which the Pope has called us, the task of reconstructing and perfecting the social order. And it is here that the Communist is superficially in a stronger position to appeal to the public than we are. His remedy is clear-cut and definite; the destruction of Capitalism root and branch by violent revolution. As Catholics, we are prejudiced against this remedy. As men of common-sense we can see that a régime like Capitalism, which is not bad in itself, though deformed by various abuses, is best reformed from within. It is precisely here that the difficulties commence. Two things, at least, are essential; *knowledge* of Catholic social principles and of social and economic facts, and *the will* to reform abuses. The motives for the latter are overwhelmingly strong; the call of the Popes, the example of non-Catholic reformers, zeal for the Kingdom of Christ, even fear of what will come about if they are not reformed. The knowledge of Catholic principles is easily gained. But the knowledge of the actual working of our economic machinery is less accessible. How are prices fixed? How are directors appointed? What is the exact power of finance, national and international, and how is it exercised? How much is taken out of the product of industry by people who are not really entitled to it, or at any rate not entitled to as much as they get?

If we are to be able to apply Catholic social principles, we should know the answers to these questions and to

many others; answers which cannot always be found in text-books of economics, and on which even expert economists differ. It is here that a wide field of social apostolate lies open to educated Catholics, and especially to those who are engaged in modern industry, commerce and finance. And this is in addition to the social apostolate of urging Catholic social principles in whatever circles one moves. "The apostles of the industrial and commercial world should themselves be employers and merchants" (*Quadragesimo Anno*). And our aim must be to secure to all classes their fair share of the world's wealth, and thus to establish social peace based on social justice and fraternal goodwill. The penalty for neglecting to do this, as Pius XI warns the world, will be the triumph of revolutionary Communism.

PLAIN CHANT A SPIRITUAL POWER

BY REV. J. O'LOGHLEN, S.T.L., M.A., H.Dipl. in Edctn.

“ DUKE : ‘ Music oft hath such a charm
To make bad good and good provoke to
harm.’ ”

(*Measure for Measure*, Act IV, Scene 2.)

TO be strictly modern it would seem as if we must return to the Ancients. Such is the fashion in studies. Yet in matters which bear upon the broad science of education fashion leads us rightly. They have much of utility to offer us. Indeed, both Aristotle and Plato have made an impression here as deep and lasting as in Scholastic Philosophy. The latter more especially is an authority not lightly to be passed over, for Plato, we must remember, was no mere theorist in the domain of education. For forty years he was an effective and influential teacher, and left behind him at his death a flourishing academia, which survived the vicissitudes of three centuries. Moreover, his planned and reasoned curriculum held sway right down through the Middle Ages and became dominant in form from the twelfth century to the French Revolution.

Now Plato's educational system was intensely moral. He aimed at the perfection of moral culture in and through æsthetic culture. Aesthetic culture was to him a true medium, an instrument, an efficient means to the attainment of a moral end and not the efficient and necessary cause of moral action in itself. It was the formation of a habit of order, of self-control, of self-discipline, a habit of judging moral values at their true worth. It is this moral force, which he rightly attributes to the musical art or study, which is most important and influential in his doctrine upon this subject, and most worthy of our consideration.

“ Musical training,” he writes, “ is a more potent instrument than any other . . . because rhythm and harmony find their way into the most secret places of the soul. . . . Education should be in Music.”¹ It is

¹ Republic 401 E., 402 A. Cf. Protagoras 325, 326.

true that the term "*ἡ μουσική*" as used by Plato had by no means the restricted signification we now attach to it. Under this term, in fact, he groups all training which bears relation to artistic form. Yet Music by reason of its moral significance casts all others into the shade. By its instrumentality is effected a harmonization of body and soul issuing into self-control in human action. A habit of spontaneous reaction against all sense of discord and disproportion is formed and developed. An intuitive power is imparted by which the student is enabled to perceive what is discordant in action and to value at its true worth what is in concord. Hence flows an appreciation of virtue and a natural repugnance to what is out of tune with moral truth and practice.

Unfortunately modern educational thought and practice has lost sight of a possible moral lever and music has degenerated into a mere physical accomplishment. That it is capable of producing such moral effects within the soul, of elevating its aspirations, stimulating its passions, and harmonizing its movements is beyond all question. Literature, both ancient and modern, teems with multifarious examples, illustrative of the universal recognition of the fact by the human race.

Music is both intellectual and emotional in its nature, equally expressive of ideas and feelings. This double aspect is well emphasized in the immortal compositions of Wagner and more especially in the tetralogical masterpiece: "*The Nibelung's Ring*." Opinion differs as to which of these elements preponderates, but none doubts for a moment the magic power of its romanticism on the imagination and feelings.

Modern critics, indeed, discuss at length the new theory which insists on intellectuality and austerity in Music as opposed to the Romanticism of our predecessors, but underlying the whole of this controversy we find the principle that music must be ultimately judged by its effect upon the inner life of its audience. No one will deny that it is capable of conveying an idea or painting a picture as well as the most fluent pen. Hence a French poet wrote with feeling:

Trois cris de flûte disent mieux la vie
Que toutes les paroles de Hésiode.

"And it is just because of this frequent conciseness of beauty of phrase and by reason of the immeasurable power possessed by the art of insinuating itself into the labyrinth of human personality that music can cast such diverse impressions on the minds and hearts of a vast audience." It matters little whether its appeal to the listener is concerned with pictorial or emotional impressions or with the intellectual appreciation of the beauty of vibrating tone. In the end they can be reduced to one and the same thing, for human emotion in music is nothing else than "the giving way to an abstract sense of the beauty of pure sound." In either case it results in the appreciation of beauty; and beauty, after all, infinite Beauty and Goodness is the ultimate norm of morality.

What further demonstration may be necessary can be drawn from the well of our own personal experience. Study, for instance, the ennobling effect of a national anthem upon the most motley crowd of citizens, the sentimental atmosphere of an old-time melody, or the dreamy sensuous beauty of an Eastern love-song. All these have their own peculiar charms and moral consequences, whether for good or evil, and few, if any of us, have not experienced at one time or another in the tiny cosmos of our own interior lives the mysterious and captivating power of music and song.

Wholeheartedly, therefore, do we agree with Plato in affirming that there exists a close and intimate connection between music and the human soul, in as much as the former possesses a power of forming and moulding the actions of the latter according to the moral code. That delicate sense of order and proportion, which is not only characteristic of music but of art in general, is calculated to induce a healthy repugnance to any disturbance of the moral order besides imparting a refinement and culture which are so necessary for social life and intercourse.

It is clear then that extreme importance must be attached to the proper type of harmony and the judicious selection of modes. The true mode Plato discovered in the Dorian mode, whereas the plaintive or melancholy type which found expression in the mixed Lydian mode, and the sensuous and melodramatic types of the Ionian and mixed Lydian mode, were considered to be in opposition to both the moral and æsthetic sense.

Now modern Europe bears a striking resemblance to the Greece of the Platonic age in this respect. Asiatic melodies flowed in through the Greek maritime cities, introducing a new era in Hellenic culture, and in like manner the sensuous music of the savage and pagan world penetrated European civilization and culture under the generic term of "jazz." The way had already been prepared for such a conquest by the absence of proper musical studies in the school, leading to corruption of popular taste and appreciation. Indeed, the very materialism of the age we live in; the continual search for novelty and pleasure; the idolatry of the senses and of sensual enjoyment of every type and form; the perverted sense of moral aims and moral values in life, provided a congenial soil for the growth of this new social weed. Modern music, then, came to us as a supreme type, a fountain-head, a very goddess of pleasure. It guaranteed to create and sustain an insatiable desire for self-indulgence and self-satisfaction; to pander to the passions of its votaries and the vulgar taste of the multitude; to strike, as it were, the very keynote of the modern spirit of idolatrized Egotism; and we are forced to admit that it has liberally redeemed its promise. "An evil sort of theocracy" has grown up in our own day just as in ancient Hellas, which bases its judgment and appreciation "on the pleasure of the hearer alone." If something, therefore, is not attempted, and attempted soon, to stem the current of this new movement, we fear to contemplate what the moral outcome may be for the whole human race. Not that we wish to exclude altogether, as did Plato, the element of pleasure, for pleasure rightly understood is necessary. It is relaxation, recreation, rest; but it must be ordained to an end outside itself that we may term it lawful. What we do want to accomplish is to purge out the leaven of rank materialism. It is the type of music, and the aim which governs the selection of that type, which are at fault. Only an efficient counter movement which will train the intellect and will of the younger generation, by frequent practice and repetition, to recognize and respond with alacrity to the call of truly great music will prove effective.

In Plain Chant we have an excellent, in fact, the most excellent instrument for such an undertaking. Of its

moral value as a distinct musical type there can be no doubt. It is essentially moral because it is religious. Hence, Pope Pius X in the "Motu Proprio" of the years 1903 and 1904 accentuated with justice the universal opinion in this respect. "Plain Chant," he said, "has always been looked upon as the highest model of Church music." Its direct aim, therefore, is neither beauty nor pleasure, though these qualities are necessarily linked up with it, but rather "to clothe the liturgical text, and to make that text more efficacious so that the faithful may be the more roused to devotion." Moreover, it possesses qualities which are in direct antithesis to the ultra-modern styles of which we have already spoken. It is said that modern music primarily aims at expressing emotion, for it is absolute in as much as it is independent for its significance of anything outside itself. If this be so, the "jazz" movement is nothing else than emotion run riot, especially in the case of those emotions of gaiety and superficial sentimentality which are alone suitable to dance music. Plain Chant, on the other hand, might be defined from this point of view as "emotion controlled," excluding, as it certainly does, that state of mind in which the emotions dominate the reason. Hence it possesses a peculiar and altogether unique power to counteract the present danger besides attaining a moral end. This is not surprising, when we reflect, that together with folk music, it approaches nearest, in matter and form, to the Grecian simplicity which Plato commends. It could, in fact, be truthfully described as the daughter of the Greek Muse. D. Ferretti, O.S.B., one of the greatest living authorities on Plain Chant, would almost seem to identify them as types. Speaking of rhythm, he says, "Da quanto si e detto consegue che nella musica Greca—e *per conseguenza* nella musica gregoriana—il tempo primo si addiziona e si moltiplica, vale a dire ha dei multipli, ma no ha dei sottomultipli. E questa indivisibilita del tempo primo che dava alla musica greca, e dà anche oggi alla musica gregoriana, un movimento e un ritmo calmo, sereno e maestoso."²

It is clear that the starting-off ground for such a movement must be the school. It is only from the rising

² *Principii Teorici e Practici di Canto Gregoriano*. Capo IV, p. 45. Cf. also p. 63.

generation that any successful issue in the way of appreciation and moral culture may be expected.

Objections from the teaching staff can be easily overruled if the priests themselves show sufficient interest and enthusiasm. It must be remembered that only a knowledge of the mere elements is necessary for primary courses and these do not differ very widely from the principles of the tonic sol-fa system, a knowledge of which is imparted to them during their training. Already in America, under the Justin Ward method of teaching, Plain Song primary teachers are being efficiently trained within the space of a couple of months. What is really vital is the whole-hearted support of the clergy, and that as far as possible, active. Unless, however, they themselves are imbued with a genuine love of the music of the Church the movement is doomed to failure. May we then look forward to a time when a systematic course in Plain Song will extend right through our Catholic educational system even to the University, or is it just another fruitless effort? The answer rests with ourselves.

HOMILETICS

BY THE VERY REV. CANON P. BOYLAN, M.A., D.Litt., D.D.

Sexagesima Sunday.

Epistle. II Cor. xi. 19-xii. 9.

The long extract from the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which appears as the Epistle in the Mass of Sexagesima Sunday, is one of the most strikingly personal passages in the Pauline Letters. St. Paul's judaizing opponents were trying at Corinth, as they had tried everywhere, to make his Apostolic work impossible or fruitless. They questioned his Apostolic authority; they misrepresented his teaching; they cast doubts on his motives; they sneered at the lack of distinction in his appearance and at the want of eloquence in his speech. They questioned the purity of his Jewish blood and the genuineness of his call to the Apostolate.

Replying to the charges and taunts of his enemies, St. Paul insists on his Jewish origin and upbringing, and outlines his missionary toils, sufferings, perils, and privations. He hints at marvellous graces that had sustained him in his labours, and at revelations that he had received. In all this apology St. Paul speaks with great reluctance of the work he has done and the privileges he has received: he would not speak of them if the success of his Apostolate were not at stake. He knows and insists on his own weakness, and his unworthiness for his high office, but his very weakness and insufficiency serve to demonstrate that God has worked in and through him. If, then, he boasts of what he has done, it is of God he boasts, and not of himself. Bodily afflictions remind the Saint constantly of his own wretchedness and frailty, but these afflictions, instead of hindering, have, by God's help, furthered his Apostolic work, and he will boast of them as a further token of Christ's abiding presence and support.

The Corinthians are wise, says the Apostle, with gentle sarcasm, and if he now boasts a little, they will surely be able to put up with his boasting! They are so far advanced in wisdom that they can bear patiently with fools, and endure such poor show of wisdom as he can make!

They are willing to be enslaved and robbed and smitten by Paul's adversaries, the judaizing pseudo-Apostles. Yet they are ready to object to the slightest chiding from Paul. The pseudo-Apostles charged Paul with weakness and want of courage, and Paul admits that appearances had been against him; but now he will boast, as they boast—even though in itself such boasting is folly!

The Judaizers boasted of their descent from Abraham, and looked with contempt on Paul's converts from heathenism. But

Paul is as truly a son of Abraham as any of his foes. If his adversaries are Aramaic-speaking Jews, he also speaks the national language of Judaism. If they are genuine Israelites, he is of equally genuine Israelite stock.

If they claim to be servants of Christ, he can make that claim more truly than they! Here we might have expected to hear the story of Paul's achievements in spreading the Gospel, but he prefers rather to speak of what he has suffered for Christ's sake. His brief narrative contains enough to show that the Acts and the other Pauline Epistles give only the merest fragment of the Apostle's history. From the Acts we have the record of four imprisonments (Philippi, Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Rome), and from the Pastoral Epistles we know that there was a second Roman imprisonment.

As the Jewish Law (Deut. xxv. 3) did not permit more than forty stripes to be inflicted on a criminal, it was customary to administer only thirty-nine, lest the legal number might be exceeded. Paul as a Roman citizen could not be legally scourged by the Romans, yet he appealed but rarely, as far as we know, to his Roman citizenship to save himself from the indignity of scourging. Acts xiv. 19 tells of the stoning of St. Paul at Lystra. Of the three shipwrecks here mentioned Acts says nothing, for the shipwreck described in Acts xxvii. took place three years after this Letter to the Corinthians was written. Neither does Acts tell us of the drifting in the open sea.

Paul's missionary life was one of restless movement. From Jerusalem to Illyricum as he says, writing to the Romans some months after the present Letter was composed, he preached the Gospel. He was constantly on the move in districts where roads and transport were unknown, and danger lurked everywhere. Disregarding fatigue and hunger and thirst, and paying no heed to discomfort of any kind, Paul never wavered for an instant in his Apostolic task. Surely his enemies cannot claim to have paid more loyal service to Christ than this!

Then to the risks and privations involved in the founding of his Churches were superadded the cares and worries caused by the Churches when they were founded. Among these must be reckoned his daily dealings with his converts, his solicitude for the welfare of all the Churches, his uneasiness at troubles and scandals of which he hears. The more he loves his Churches the more he is worried about them. Lest the record of his sacrifices and labours might seem to spring from vanity, Paul throws in here the reference to his somewhat ignominious flight from Damascus three years after his conversion.

The Corinthians were proud of their Gnosis—their special knowledge, but Paul has seen the secrets of God. He speaks with reticence of his graces of revelation and vision. He will not even use the first person—hardly venturing to claim that he, Paul, had such marvellous experiences. He will boast of these privileges—but only because such boasting is about God rather than about himself. He will boast at the same time of

his own weakness, because that weakness brings into greater relief the power of God, Who can accomplish so much with such a poor instrument. Paul hopes that his converts will not be moved by his boasting to account him as of greater worth than he is, and so he gives another token of his weakness—the thorn in his flesh. It is not possible to determine precisely what form of physical infirmity is here implied, but it is something by which he is tormented as Job's body was by Satan, and it clearly serves as a counterpoise to the amazing privileges that he has received. So grievous has this smiting of Satan been, that he has prayed to be released from its bitterness. God, however, has shown him that patient endurance of this trial will give him greater strength for his Apostolic work. Of this thorn in the flesh, then, Paul will also boast because his own weakness reveals the strength of Christ.

SUGGESTIONS FOR SERMONS.

St. Paul as our model in preparing for Lent.

In the Epistle the life and work of St. Paul are put before us as an inspiration to unselfish devotion and loyalty in the service of Christ.

St. Paul appears here as utterly dedicated to God, utterly devoted to his calling. His service to Christ in his Apostolate is unquestioning and unstinted. In that service he shrinks from no difficulty, fears no peril, refuses no sacrifice. In all the favours he receives he is conscious of his own weakness and he rejoices in that weakness, and in renunciation and suffering—if only Christ's interests are thereby promoted.

All this can be illustrated from the text of the Epistle, and special emphasis should be placed on the consolation which patiently borne adversity and weakness bring, and on the support of God's grace which is given to those whose sole purpose in life is the fulfilment of God's will.

The whole life of St. Paul was a way of the Cross, and the cheerful loyalty with which he bore his trials he is for us an immortal and inspiring example. Difficulties were for him but an incitement to greater effort and to more serene joy in his allotted work.

As for St. Paul his Apostolic life was one unending struggle, so for us Christians, our daily lives are full of difficulty. We have to fight daily against temptation, sin, routine, sloth, and against defects of character and disposition; and we often remember only the burden of struggle, forgetting that our trials are, when looked at rightly, a genuine blessing.

Our Christian virtue is increased by difficulty and struggle, and were these altogether absent, we might become inert and spiritually unprogressive and lifeless.

The Cross is with us daily—though we constantly seek to avoid it. The parent has to face it in the training of his children, the business man in the failure of business and loss of wealth. We

cannot evade the Cross and we should try to bear it as St. Paul bore it—with complete resignation to God's will and a steady determination to make of our troubles a pathway to heaven.

Quinquagesima Sunday.

Epistle. I Cor. xiii. 1-13.

The section of the First Epistle to the Corinthians from which to-day's Epistle is derived, is taken up with a discussion of the Charisms—those special outpourings of the Holy Spirit which were so striking a feature of early Christianity. The Corinthian Christians were disputing among themselves about the relative importance of the Charisms, and St. Paul shows that the less sensational Charisms may be more profitable to the Corinthian Church than the others. The Charisms are intended to promote the spiritual life of the community, and their value is to be estimated according to the degree in which they serve that end.

But St. Paul would put before the Corinthians a way to serve the brethren, which is better than that of the Charisms. This way is the practice of fraternal charity. In a wonderful Hymn to Charity St. Paul sets forth, (a) the relations of Charity to the Charisms (1-3); (b) the qualities of active Charity (4-7); (c) the eternal persistence of Charity (8-13).

(a) Without Charity the Charisms are empty and worthless. Apart from Charity speaking in tongues is no better than the clashing of cymbals. Even were the tongues such as angels speak, they would be futile without Charity. So also the Charisms of "Wisdom" and "Knowledge" and mountain-moving "Faith" are worthless by themselves. Even complete surrender of our possessions to the poor and the giving up of our bodies to the death of fire, if they bear only the outward semblance of Charismatic enthusiasm and are not inspired by genuine Charity, are of no avail.

Without Charity, which includes the sincere will to serve our neighbour, there is, then no real value in the Charisms.

(b) The rhapsody on Charity in vv. 4-7 indicates its supreme importance in the eyes of Paul.

Charity is forbearing and generous: it knows neither jealousy, nor boasting, nor vanity: it is courteous and selfless: it is never roused to bitterness; it suspects no evil; it takes no pleasure in evil-doing: it rejoices in and with truth: it covers up (not "it endures") all the defects of others; it believes all things: it hopes always for good; it patiently endures all things.

(c) When every Charism shall fail Charity will still abide. "Prophecy" shall be done away, "Tongues" shall cease, Gnosis (the Charism of Knowledge) shall come to naught. "Knowledge" and "Prophecy" are but fragmentary and must disappear when the fullness of salvation is attained. As the full-grown man puts away as idle and worthless what he rejoiced in as a child, so must the Christian, when he has grown

to his full measure of the stature of Christ, put away such things of spiritual immaturity as the Charismatic endowments.

What we now know of things divine is like the knowledge of objects derived from their distorted reflection in a defective mirror. What we know of God through His reflection in the mirror of Nature is like a riddle: it raises more problems than it solves. By the somewhat confused imagery that St. Paul here uses he wishes to convey that our knowledge of God in this life is, on the one hand, mediate; and, on the other, imperfect—mere fragmentary knowledge of something obscurely grasped.

But when the completion of all things comes, our knowledge of God will no longer be mediate: we shall see Him face to face: our knowledge of Him will then be no longer fragmentary; it will resemble His knowledge of us: it will be without riddle or obscurity. To this perfection of knowledge will no doubt correspond perfection of love.

From all this we should expect the conclusion that when perfection comes, Charity alone abides. Yet Paul does not say this clearly. He seems to put Faith and Hope along with Charity as surviving in the state of glory. Yet this fits neither the context nor the facts, and we must assume that the customary triadic grouping, Faith, Hope and Charity, which we so often meet in the Pauline writings, has led St. Paul to put Faith and Hope along with Charity in the present passage. In the Parousia, then, when all Charismatic endowments fail, Charity alone survives and flourishes.

SERMON THEMES.

Each of the divisions of the Epistle furnishes abundance of material for sermons.

(1) The importance of fraternal Charity.

Love for the brethren, which is rooted in the love of God, is the chief inspiration and strength of the Christian life. On the love of God and the love of the neighbour hang the Law and the Prophets.

Charity to the brethren is better for us and for them than all Wisdom and Knowledge and Eloquence: without Charity these are cold and futile and ineffective.

It is not enough for the Catholic to attend Mass, receive the Sacraments and fulfil the precepts of the Church; he must also practice genuine Charity—that goodness and generosity of heart which impels him to seek out the sinner and unbeliever, to respect and uphold the good name of his neighbour, and to be ready with effective help when the neighbour's need demands it.

Such high things of the Christian life as extreme asceticism and self-discipline are excellent if they are combined with Charity, but without it they lose most of their meaning, and tend to become mere forms of selfish vanity.

Active Charity is the life, as it were, of Faith and Knowledge, and it is that which gives to our actions the highest value in God's sight.

(2) The chief qualities of true Fraternal Charity.

St. Paul emphasizes three of these :

(I) Forbearance—shown in uncomplaining endurance of the defects and shortcomings of the brethren.

(II) Generosity—which St. Paul makes to include the desire to find good in others in spite of appearances, the habit of kindly appreciation, the readiness to pardon all that seems to offend.

(III) Unselfishness—the refusal to put one's own interests first, or to regard one's own qualities as most perfect, the unhesitating readiness to acknowledge all the good one finds in others.

These qualities of Charity make it a power for good beyond all Charisms, within the community. No unpleasant experiences can dishearten or embitter the Christian who is inspired with genuine practical Charity : no refusal of gratitude, no misunderstanding, no calumny can deflect him from the path of generosity. Not even the ingratitude which requites good with evil can disturb him. His charity hides away his neighbour's sins and defects : he brings peace and reconciliation wherever he goes. Injustice and unfairness he not only forgives but forgets.

First Sunday of Lent.

Epistle. II Cor. vi. 1-10.

Many charges had been made against St. Paul by his critics in Corinth. He had been accused of misleading his converts, of seeking his own glory, of being lacking in dignity. It was said that he had no right to call himself an Apostle since he had not been an eye-witness of the life and work of the Lord. To be silent in face of charges like these would imperil the success of his Apostolate, and so, for the sake of the Gospel, he makes reply, and his reply is a wonderful blend of humility and Apostolic dignity. In the section of his Apology, which we read in to-day's Gospel, he first reminds his readers of the grace which they have received in being called to the Faith and the responsibilities which that grace brings with it (vv. 1-2). Then, in a series of remarkable antitheses, he resumes the defence of his Apostolic office (vv. 3-10). To-day's Epistle should be read in close connection with the Epistle of Sexagesima Sunday.

With full consciousness of his Apostolic dignity St. Paul calls himself a fellow-worker of God. As God's Apostle he has made known Christ's work to the Corinthians, and summoned them to the Faith. But mere acceptance of the Faith is not enough : those who have believed and have been baptized have put on Christ and must walk in newness of life with Him.

But there is a risk that the Corinthians have lost sight of many of the obligations implied in their Christianity. Their Church has suffered from disputes and divisions, and there have been relapses of Corinthian Christians into the immoralities of paganism. Against all this Paul would warn them with all the responsibility of a fellow-worker of God: it must not appear as if the Corinthians had received God's grace in vain.

To give more solemnity to his warning Paul quotes Is. xlix. 8—the reply of God to the complaint of His "Servant" that he (the Servant) has toiled in vain. The Servant of the Lord was to be the Light of the Gentiles and Paul implies that He has become Light of the Corinthians and that, therefore, the day of their Salvation has come. It depends on the manner in which they use the graces they have received, whether Paul's preaching has been for them a source of blessing or a ground of condemnation.

With verse 3 Paul's Apology begins: it goes on to v. 10, and in v. 11 (not in to-day's Epistle) the special admonitions and warnings, for which verses 1 and 2 have prepared us, begin.

The construction of the Greek text in v. 3 ff gives the sense:

"We who exercise our Apostolic office so as, not only to give to none a cause of offence, but to show that we are in all things servants of Christ—(a) in the sufferings of our Apostolic life; (b) in the virtues and duties of our calling; (c) and in the presence of the hostile criticism of men—we exhort you, etc."

For the sake of his Apostolic office Paul has always been at pains to give not even the least ground for offence. He has, moreover, always exhorted his converts to make their Faith respected among outsiders by the excellence of their own lives. He has tried to forestall criticism of his Apostolate by showing himself to be in all things a true servant of Christ.

In a manner similar to II Cor. xi. 23-33 he proves his loyal service of Christ by outlining the toils and difficulties of his missionary career. As in II Cor. xi., we can identify some of the things referred to from Acts, but the references here are for the most part very general. The huge extent of Paul's missionary travels brought with it enormous difficulties of every kind. His missionary work had been done in the midst of privations—in cold and hunger and nakedness (3-5).

With v. 6 Paul begins the enumeration of the qualities which mark him out as a true servant of God.

First, there is his chastity—which, as something in their eyes rare, would greatly impress the Corinthians. Then there is his knowledge—so different from the pretentious Gnosis of the Corinthians. Further, there are the forbearance and gentleness with which he has endured the Corinthians and corrected them like a father. All his conduct has been inspired by the Holy

Spirit, and so his attitude to the Corinthians ought to be utterly above question or suspicion.

As servant of God he has announced only what is true, and the truth of his preaching has been shown by the wonders of God's power that have accompanied it. In the consciousness that the divine Power sustains him Paul carries the weapons of his Apostolic warfare: with the sword in his right hand and the shield in his left, he stands firm against all the attacks of his enemies. The weapons of his adversaries may be poisoned with falsehood and calumny, but his are the weapons of "justice"—such weapons as are duly demanded for the defence of God's cause.

Whether his Apostolic work has brought him honour or disrepute, calumny or praise, whether he is thought to be honest or a charlatan, he knows that he has the truth of God on his side.

Often he has been sneered at as one of no importance, and yet his work has flourished. He has been at death's door, and yet through God's help he still survives. He has been scourged and yet, in spite of his bodily frailty, he still lives.

However wretched and miserable he may be esteemed by men, he carries joy in his own heart in his union with Christ. However poor he may be in the world's goods, he has imparted the wealth of God's blessings to many. He has neither money, nor distinction, nor influence, and yet he has everything that matters; he has the truth and grace of God, and even the Son of God Himself—the source and centre of all true wealth and knowledge and power.

From all this it can be seen that Paul is a genuine servant of Christ.

SERMON THEME.

I. The true spirit of the Christian life.

This is suggested by St. Paul's Apology in the Epistle. He appears here as a true servant of Christ and we can apply to ourselves the lessons that his picture of Christ's loyal servant teaches:

(1) The true Christian life demands unstinted love of Christ—absolute loyalty in His service. In all things we must loyally serve Christ as Paul served Him (Cf. verses 4-5).

(2) We have at our disposal the same armoury of grace that Paul had. The callings in which we find ourselves represent God's Providence in our regard, just as his Apostolic Office was assigned by God's grace to Paul. If we are loyal in serving God in our calling, we may expect to receive God's help as Paul received it.

(3) The genuine Christian rejoices, like Paul, above all things, in the possession of Christ. In Christ the Christian has true wealth and happiness.

II. Lent as a Season of Grace.

The Church has chosen II Cor. vi, 1ff as the Epistle of the first Sunday of Lent because of verse 2. Lent is an acceptable time, a day of salvation :

- (a) because it is a time of special prayer;
- (b) because it is a time of serious self-examination, self-reformation, and penance;
- (c) because it is a time for the energetic practise of virtue—of self-denial, of charity, of patient endurance of trial; it is a time to show ourselves true servants of God in our various callings as St. Paul was a servant of God in his Apostolic calling;
- (d) because the Liturgy of Lent makes so clear that message which Paul preached to the Corinthians—the message of Christ crucified, and all that it means to us.

Second Sunday of Lent.

Epistle. I Thess. iv. 1-7.

The Church of Thessalonica, to which this Epistle was addressed, was still very young; its members had been recruited mainly from among pagans, and all traces of old pagan habits of sensuality and avarice had not yet quite disappeared from among the Thessalonian Christians.

St. Paul begins by stating that the Thessalonians are doing well, but he goes on to say that, if they are to conform themselves fully to the standards that he had put before them in his preaching, they must do much better.

He appeals to them in the name of the Lord Jesus—that is, in virtue of the mystic union of Christians with Christ, to aim at a higher standard of Christian living. It is not enough that they should believe that Christ is the Son of God; their lives must be conformed to Christian ideals. The instructions which they received from Paul are the message of Christ Himself, and the burden of those instructions has been, "Be ye holy!" It is the will of God that they should be holy, that their lives should be completely in harmony with His commands. The "holiness" required includes the whole sphere of conduct, and must not be limited to "purity" in the special sense.

In the maintenance of that "holiness" two vices have especially to be shunned—impurity and avarice. These vices strike at the very root and foundation of the Christian life.

Paul warns the Thessalonians to keep from "fornication" (sexual sin generally), and to honour ("know," "acknowledge," "recognize the due position of") their wives ("vessel"=wife). They must acquire for themselves wives in that spirit of holiness, and of reverence which befits the servants of Christ—not in the lustfulness of passion, like the pagans.

Paul warns them further that they must not seek to overreach and outwit their brethren in commercial dealings.

These warnings against unchastity and avarice are strengthened by a reference to the Jugment to come, in which the Lord will mete out due punishment to impiety and injustice. This Paul has impressed on them already, and he will remind them thereof again. The Thessalonians must bear in mind that their call to Christianity is a call away from sin and unto holiness, and that there is no room for sin, or contact with sin in the Christian life.

SERMON THEME.

Christian Holiness.

"God has not called us to uncleanness, but to holiness in Christ Jesus, Our Lord." For those who have put off the "old man" of sin and put on the "new man" of grace there should be no contact with sin; they that are dead to sin should live only for God. The Christian life means life in union with Christ, and one cannot belong to Christ and at the same time be a slave to sin and uncleanness.

The "holiness" to which the Christian is called is complete conformity to God's commands, single-minded execution of God's will. It is "holiness" of heart and "holiness" of conduct.

Holiness of heart excludes not merely impurity, but envy, anger, vindictiveness, enmity, and every other vice that would disturb a man's friendship with God or his peace with the brethren.

Holiness of external conduct implies (a) "holiness" in speech—excluding "all bitterness and violence and angry, abusive speech—and every kind of spite" (Eph. iv. 31); (b) "holiness" of deportment—for the genuine Christian, as one who has been chosen by God, and is therefore loved by God, must "clothe himself with tenderness of heart, kindness, humility, gentleness, forbearance" (Col. iii. 12); (c) "holiness" of action—excluding all selfishness and avarice. This "holiness" of conduct includes the energetic practice of charity, and the faithful fulfilment of the Church's precepts.

In brief, the holiness to which the Christian is called implies three things: (a) giving to God what is His; (b) keeping oneself pure and undefiled; (c) exercising scrupulous fairness and brotherly kindness in dealing with one's neighbour.

To this holiness we are called by the will of God, by the example of Christ, and by the fear of God's judgment.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE D. SMITH, Ph.D., D.D.

The *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*¹ continues to plough its erudite way through the alphabet, having reached the article *Philopald* with the end of the first half of the twelfth volume. It is impossible in the short space at our disposal to give anything like an adequate idea of the valuable contents of this half-volume. Suffice it to say that it includes the two titles *Péché* and *Pénitence*; and these two articles, if we consider only their length, would each make a respectable book of three or four octavo volumes. The first of these, on Actual Sin, deals very fully and clearly with a subject which, as its learned author, Th. Deman, rightly says, usually arouses in the modern theologian "plus d'effroi que d'analyse." At any rate the dogmatic theologian is often too apt to regard the subject of actual sin as belonging exclusively to the province of the moralist; the latter, in his turn, being often so occupied with his catalogues of sins as to have little time to study the theology of sin in general. The author gives us an excellent exposition of the theology of St. Thomas; and if any part of his work is to be singled out for special praise, it is perhaps the thirty columns which are devoted to a masterly analysis of venial sin.

The lengthy and learned article on Original Sin is contributed by A. Gaudel; and no theologian would be wise to deal further with the matter without having consulted it. Especially valuable is the author's treatment of the history of this dogma during the period preceding St. Augustine; an aspect of the subject which seldom receives the attention that it deserves. While paying due homage to the theological genius of St. Augustine himself, M. Gaudel is careful to point out that "il serait faux de prétendre que cette synthèse augustinienne s'identifie, dans tous ses éléments, avec la doctrine de l'Eglise sur le péché d'origine" (col. 401). Nevertheless the Augustinian synthesis, as presented to us by the learned author, would perhaps have been juster and more complete, and incidentally would have seemed less startlingly precursory of the Lutheran view, had some reference been made to the distinction between the natural and the supernatural order which, latently indeed but not the less really, pervades the teaching of the Doctor of Grace. On this important point, which constitutes the crucial difference between the Catholic and the Lutheran doctrine on original sin, a valuable study appeared in 1931 from the pen of M. Paul

¹ Letouzey et Ané.

Dumont who, in a series of articles entitled *Le surnaturel dans la théologie de saint Augustin* (*Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, October, 1931, *seq.*), showed, I think successfully, that St. Augustine did not fail to grasp this fundamental truth. (See CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. IV, page 54.)

The article *Pénitence* is divided into four main parts: I *La pénitence primitive* (i.e., from the New Testament to the end of the sixth century) and II *La pénitence privée* (until the Fourth Lateran Council), contributed by E. Amann; while the third and fourth parts bring the history and theology of Penance up to the present time, and are written by A. Michel. The whole constitutes a monumental study in which practically all the results of intensive modern research, as well as an exhaustive account of the progress made in the theory of the Sacrament of Penance, have been embodied. Moreover, it possesses an advantage not enjoyed by all the articles of this Dictionary: that of being clearly and schematically arranged with a view to easy reference.

The *Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche*,² of which the fifth volume (*Hexapla to Kirchweihe*) has just appeared, while not attaining or even laying claim to the amplitude of the *Dictionnaire* above mentioned, achieves a concision combined with clearness and completeness which is very remarkable. Bibliographical indications are abundant, and no expense has been spared in order by typographical devices to make the work a most handy book of reference. The volume under notice contains few articles of interest to the dogmatic theologian as such; but these few are very good indeed. We may take as a specimen the article *Himmel*, consisting of three sections dealing respectively with the dogmatic, the biblical, the historical aspects of Heaven, and concluding with a treatment of the subject from the standpoint of the comparative history of religions. The first section in some 300 words includes all the essential truths of dogmatic theology on Heaven; and it would be difficult to combine more successfully perfect accuracy with commendable brevity. Perhaps in view of the universal teaching of the Church on the matter (and in spite of Pope Benedict XIV),³ it is saying too little to call the Assumption (col. 52) an "allgemeine fromme Meinung." There are many *piae opinioniones* which have not quite the same claim on the belief of Catholics as this, which in the view of many theologians is proximately definable as a dogma of faith. And Pope Benedict XIV himself adds: "Numquid licuerit eam amplecti vel aspernari, tueri vel refellere? Minime." Be it said, however, that the author of the article does not for a moment suggest that the Assumption is a doctrine which any Catholic may legitimately deny. The article *Hölle* is as concisely excellent as its counterpart *Himmel*. In the light of modern tendencies to interpret "hell-fire" metaphorically, it is worth

² Herder, Freiburg.

³ *De festis B.M.V.*, cap viii., n. 18.

noting that the author characterizes "the physical reality of hell-fire as the certain conviction of patristic and scholastic theology. It is not a question of earthly fire, but of something whose nature is unknown to us, and which is external, i.e., distinct from the sinner himself; something which tortures him body and soul, and by reason of its severity is called 'fire.'" The article *Jesus Christus* is disappointingly brief, so far as dogmatic theology is concerned. But perhaps it is as yet too early to judge, since it may be intended to treat Christological subjects under other titles.

From Herder's English and American branch comes *A Compendium of Theology*, "comprising the Essential Doctrinal Points of both Dogmatic and Moral Theology, together with the more Important Notions of Canon Law, Liturgy, Pastoral and Mystical Theology, and Christian Philosophy."⁴ This work has a history. It was originally written by its author, the Rev. J. Berthier, in Latin, in the year 1887, in order that by reading a little of it every day the busiest priest might "review his entire seminary course in one year." The author subsequently republished his work in French, and this present translation, by the Rev. Sidney A. Raemers, M.A., Ph.D., is made from the fifth, and completely revised edition of the French text, recast "in an endeavour to have it comply with the regulations of the New Code of Canon Law."

The dogmatic theology is contained for the most part in the first volume; the second volume being devoted chiefly to the moral and pastoral aspects of sacramentary theology, though some few points of dogma are not lacking here, while its final chapters treat briefly of the *Novissima*. The task of compressing so much theology, as well as a little philosophy, into the space of less than four hundred pages was not an easy one; and yet it has been done, and done with a measure of success. But it must be said that clearness, and sometimes even accuracy, have suffered in the process. Thus, for example, surely it is not accurate to identify the *criteria* of certitude with "the positive means at man's disposal to attain to" it (p. 4). Moreover, the following statement of the dogma of the Divine Maternity of Mary is somewhat startling: "Mary is the Mother of Him to whom she gave birth. True, *she did not bring forth the Word*, whose generation is eternal; but she did bring forth Jesus Christ, Who is God, and therefore she is the Mother of God" (p. 308). (Italics mine.) Perhaps the busy priest will also be baffled by the following: "Consequently any being which is complete enough substantially that its substance, as such, cannot be completed by adding another principle, can never form one substantial whole with it"; or by this: "The human nature of Christ cannot be the proprietor of its own existence, but this existence must be held *quasi-formally* by that of the Word" (p. 305-6). (Italics not mine.) Or again: "The accidents (of

⁴ Four vols. Vol. I, pp. xv-378; Vol. II, pp. vi-595. 12s. 6d.; 18s.

the body of Christ in the Eucharist) are nothing more than the manner in which the substance is present" (p. 244). It is unfortunate that for reasons of space exact references are not given when the view of a particular theologian is quoted (p. vi.). One would otherwise have had the opportunity of verifying the statement, at first somewhat surprising, that "Cardinal Billot maintains with other theologians that Jesus Christ is not present in each portion of the host before the division" (Vol. II, p. 77). This view, entirely at variance both with the principles and with the explicit teaching of St. Thomas (not to mention the overwhelming authority of theological consensus) is certainly not maintained by Billot in the fifth edition of his *De Sacramentis*, where he writes (Vol. I, p. 492): "Christus Deus et homo perfectus cum tota sua quantitate dimensiva et statura naturali, sub qualibet hostia et quavis parte ejus adest totus, sive ante sive post fractionem sacramenti. Dico sive ante fractionem sive post, quia argumentum evidenter id ostendit. . . ." One can only suppose, therefore, either that the eminent and lamented theologian abandoned his Thomistic principles in a subsequent edition which I have not seen, or else that the author (or editor) of the *Compendium*—is it possible?—has misread another perfectly Thomistic statement which occurs on the same page of Billot's work: "Quod Christus non est *pluries* sub dimensionibus hostiae ante factam divisionem." Brevity may be purchased sometimes at too great a cost.

The learned professor of dogmatic theology at the seminary of Malines, Dr. Van Hove, has published a *Tractatus de sanctissima Eucharistia*,⁵ and it would be difficult to speak too highly in its praise. The work contains all that is necessary for the student on the Eucharist, whether in dogma, moral theology or Canon Law. In dogmatic theology the principles of St. Thomas are strictly followed; though recent developments receive proper and judicious attention. Perhaps the most valuable part of the book are the chapters in which the author deals with the thorny question of the essence of the Eucharistic sacrifice. In view of the voluminous literature which has appeared on this subject during recent years, and the bewildering variety of opinions which now confront him, the theologian may well approach with some diffidence the task of reducing chaos to order. Dr. Van Hove has been eminently successful, and one completes the reading of the fifty pages which he devotes to the subject with the feeling that the opinions which matter, and the opinions which essentially differ from one another, are not so very numerous after all. The author successfully draws a modest veil over his own view; though I think he rather favours Billot. His criticisms of the opinion of de la Taille are two: "(1) Non satis apparere quare oblatio *coenae* ad ipsum sacrificium *crucis* vere requiratur, ac si hoc in seipso completum non esset. Nec (2) ullum aliud prostat exemplum oblationis

⁵ Dessain, 1933.

sacrificialis alicujus victimae immolandae. Ceteroquin praesupposita identitas numerica inter sacrificium crucis et sacrificium eucharisticum multis videtur fundamentum satis labile." Perhaps, however, the second objection is not a very serious one, because in any view of the Eucharistic sacrifice it must be admitted that the sacrifice of the New Law is unique of its kind.

Polemical literature is usually short-lived; like a bomb it ceases to be useful when it has accomplished its work of destruction. But not always; for the apologist may do his work in two ways. He may carry the war into the enemy's country by attacking the doctrines, methods or even the morals of his opponent; if so, from a theological point of view the value of his work will be ephemeral. On the other hand, he may think (rightly) that the most solid defence of the faith is to be found in the proper understanding of it, that he can best entrench himself against the superficial attacks of heresy by digging deep into the principles of his faith. If he does this his work will be lasting. Thus, while much of the literature occasioned by the modernist movement of the early twentieth century has now been forgotten with the modernists themselves, some of it—the solid work—remains. Among the books of permanent value which appeared during those troubled years must surely be counted Gardeil's *Le Donné Révélé et la Théologie*, of which a second edition now appears.⁶ Here the modernist contention—that the dogmas of the Church are subject to the same vicissitudes as purely human sciences, that they are mere symbols which represent the progressive evolution of the universal religious consciousness, and therefore need to be re-stated to suit the practical or scientific needs of the age—is met by a profound and scientific study of the intimate relation existing between theology and the deposit of faith. Revealed truth is the objective principle of theology, its primary source; its subjective principle is the human mind, enlightened by supernatural faith. Therefore, the function of faith does not cease with the acceptance of revealed truth; it continues to enlighten the theologian in his subsequent speculations on the data of revelation. The theologian is a man of faith. "*La véritable science théologique . . . est une science sacrée dans toute la force du terme . . . doctrina sacra. Elle se présente comme le prolongement authentique et homogène de la révélation, et la révélation s'explique en elle. . . . La science théologique participe formellement au caractère surnaturel des principes de foi qui s'expliquent et se développent en elle et par elle.*" Thus the curiosity of the philosopher, the critical attitude of the historian, the accuracy of the scientist are pressed into the service of the queen of sciences, enlightened, guided and, if need be, corrected by the supernatural virtue of faith.

⁶ Editions du Cerf, Juvisy.

II. ASCETICAL AND MYSTICAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. J. CARTMELL, D.D., Ph.D., M.A.

Despite the admission of Mr. Attwater as a collaborator, the new edition of *Butler's Lives of the Saints* progresses only slowly. This is due no doubt to the scrupulous care which so extensive a work demands. In the volumes for April and August¹ Miss Leeson and Mr. Attwater have written the actual lives, and Fr. Thurston has compiled the critical and bibliographical notes. These volumes maintain the standard of quality noted by the reviewer of their predecessors in the *CLERGY REVIEW* of September, 1932. The editors incorporate most of Alban Butler's original biographies; but they have recast them so completely, in matter sometimes as well as in form, and have added, naturally, so many new lives of recent Saints and Beati that the resulting collection is virtually a new work. There are possibly many who do not like this wholesale transformation of Butler; he should have the sacred inviolability of the other great works, such as Challoner's *Meditations* and the *Garden of the Soul*, which have wielded a dominant influence in the religious formation of our people. But against this objection it may be justly argued that the revisers are only doing what Butler himself would have done had he been still living. He had a refined historical sense, and would want his work to be adjusted to the best canons of historical criticism. And there was so much fresh material to include that, in order to ensure the unity of the whole, the original part must be modernized.

In the present volumes the beatified English Martyrs are included, as usual, under their dates of martyrdom.² B. Louise de Marillac, who was accidentally omitted from the March volume, is treated in an appendix in the April volume. Two interesting additions to the August volume are the life of St. Tarcisius, whose cultus has become popular through the spread of frequent Communion, and the discussion of the evidence for the existence of St. Philomena. Concerning this saint the conclusion is that there is a saint in Heaven who grants favours when invoked as St. Philomena; but it is unknown whether her name on earth was Philomena, whether she was a martyr, and whether her relics are at Mugnano, which claims them, or in some other place. An account of the Portiuncula Indulgence is also given, under August 2nd.

One statement in the article on the Assumption needs modification. The writer says that the Assumption is "a traditional belief in the Church, not indeed an article of faith but, according to Benedict XIV, a probable opinion the denial of which would be impious and blasphemous." He seems to be following the *Catholic Encyclopædia*. It is true that Benedict

¹ Burns Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. Each vol., 7s. 6d.

² Except B. Margaret Clitherow whom the editors have transferred deliberately from March 25th, on which her feast could not be kept, to April 2nd.

XIV so taught. But other theologians had spoken more strongly, including Suarez, who is a leading authority in specifying the theological status of a doctrine. Suarez says: "Est igitur iam nunc tam recepta haec sententia, ut a nullo pio et Catholico possit in dubium revocari, aut sine temeritate negari; atque adeo videtur habere eum gradum certitudinis, quem habet alia veritas de sanctificatione Virginis in utero matris."³ Theologians to-day agree that the Assumption is at least certain. Van Noort writes: "argumentis theologicis ita constat, ut sine temeritate negari non possit. Alii graviolem censuram statuunt."⁴

The second fascicle of the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* has appeared. It opens with *Allemande (Spiritualité)*, continued from the previous fascicle, and closes with *Anglaise (Spiritualité)*, an unfinished article. Irish spirituality is treated along with English, since, as the writer says, although there were differences in detail between the English and the Irish in their conception of the Christian life, the Irish exercised from the beginning a religious influence over the Anglo-Saxons, and the Anglo-Saxons in a lesser degree over the Irish. Their spiritualities had points of contact and fused more and more as political unity and unity of language were established. Canon Vernet of Lyons is the writer of this article and also of the article on German spirituality. He is already known in this country by his excellent book, *Medieval Spirituality*, published in Sands's Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge. We hope to discuss the article at length when it is complete. The other noteworthy articles in this number are *Ame (Structure)*, *Américanisme*, *Amitié*, *Amour-Propre*, *Anéantissement*, *Anges*; and a fine study of St. Alphonsus Liguori. The article, *Ame (Structure)*, will be most useful to students of mysticism. It discusses the point of insertion in the soul of the mystic graces and gives a synthesis of the currents of theological thought on this matter from the beginning of Christianity down to modern times. St. Paul said that the word of God pierced to the division of the soul and the spirit. The Neo-Platonists taught that union with the One was attained by an active ascension from the senses to the reason and from the reason to the mind; by the mind man became one with the One. Christian mystical writers took up St. Paul's doctrine of the spirit as distinct in some way from, and superior to, the soul, and the Neo-Platonic doctrine of the contemplating mind, fused them, and gave grace its due place in the work of union. They teach, therefore, that the "mens" (mind) is the place of insertion of the mystic graces; it is both the depth and apex of the soul, beyond and above which is God, according to St. Augustine's phrase, "Tu eras interior intimo meo et superior summo meo." But the theologians differ in explaining the nature of this "mens." For St. Augustine it

³ *De Incarn.*, q. xxxviii, a. iv, disp. xxi, sect. ii, n. 9.

⁴ *Tract. de Deo Redemptore*, Sect. iii, art. iii.

is the memory, by which he means not just the faculty of recalling, but either the psychological conscience or the sub-conscious mind whence consciousness emerges; God is habitually in union with it, it is made like to Him by infused Wisdom (mens-imago-sapiens), and now and then it may catch sight of Him "in the flash of a trembling glance" (acies mentis). For St. Thomas, the "mens" is the intellect informed by Faith and illumined by the Gift of Wisdom; it attains God, not directly, but in a quasi-experience, i.e., it savours Him in a created effect; He comes to it as the Unknown (omnino Ignotum)). For St. Bonaventure, following St. Bernard, it is the will, tending to God habitually in its highest part and occasionally transported in a flash of love (scintilla) which is a direct experience of God. For the Rhineland mystics the "mens" is neither intellect nor will, although these powers share the experience and are the means of attaining God as Three in Persons (sub ratione Veri et Boni); but it is the essence of the soul, the meeting-place of intellect and will, which Eckhart calls the soul's Castle and the Spanish mystics, who were dominated by the Rhineland, its Centre or its Substance; this essence of the soul attains God in His supreme Oneness as the Super-Essence. It is to Ruysbroeck that we owe the finest synthesis of the mystical structure of the soul. All currents of thought met in him—the Augustinian, which stressed mainly the active ascension to God; the pseudo-Dionysian, which emphasized passivity ("divina pati"); the Thomistic, which introduced the acuteness and severity of metaphysics into the mystical theories on the nature of the soul and its possible relations to God; and the Rhenish which was a direct revival of Neo-Platonism in its doctrine of the union of the soul with God as the Super-Essence, and of Augustinianism in its doctrine of the union by means of the image of the Trinity within the soul. Later ages add little to Ruysbroeck. The best modern syntheses, those of Père Maréchal⁵ and of Père Gardeil,⁶ although more scientific in treatment than his, are forestalled by him.

Messrs. Washbourne and Bogan have begun a new series called Faith Books. Two of the series are already published. They are *The Priest's Companion*⁷ and *Mystical Flowers from Calvary*.⁸ The former proposes a workable ideal for priests. It is in three parts. The first consists of prayers and devotions—for morning and evening, preparation and thanksgiving at Mass, visits to the Blessed Sacrament. Many of the earlier prayers are already in the Breviary, in the Praeparatio ad Missam and Gratiarum Actio post Missam, and in the Appendix; but the new arrangement is useful. The second part gives sixty-two simple, sensible meditations, dealing with a retrospect of the seminary and the

⁵ *Studies in the Psychology of the Mystics* (Burns Oates, 6s.).

⁶ *La Structure de l'âme et l'expérience mystique* (Gabalda, 2 vols., 35 fr.).

⁷ By the Rev. B. F. Marcetteau, S.S.; 3s. 6d.

⁸ Trans. from a Spanish selection, by T. M. L. Fraser; 2s. 6d.

priest's moral, spiritual and apostolic life. The third part contains a rule of life which could be usefully pondered during recollections and retreats, to maintain or revive fervour. The other book is a collection of thoughts from St. Paul of the Cross for every day of the year. The translation betrays the Spanish origin of the collection.

*Christ in the World of To-day*⁹ comprises six lectures delivered in St. Francis Xavier's, Upper Gardiner Street, Dublin, last Lent. They put forward devotion to the Sacred Heart as the Providential remedy against all the chief dangers of the day. The titles are: The New Science and the Old Love; Manna for the Modernist; Man and Woman and the Sacred Heart; Christ and the Machine; Communism or Christ the King; The Heart of our Saviour and the Man of To-day. The lectures deserve a wide popularity. They are clear and thoughtful; and the author writes with a freshness and simple eloquence that stimulate and appeal.

*The Art of Living With God*¹⁰ is a popular exposition of the life of grace. The Most Rev. author is rather dry in his description of the organism of grace, but he warms up when he treats of the sacraments and the visible Church. The account of the Holy Eucharist and of the ideal Christian home are excellent. It is an apostolic book, both dogmatic and devotional. But in dealing with the Redemption he takes the rigid Anselmian view of the necessity of Redemption.

*The Eucharistic Triumph*¹¹ is a short account of Ireland's devotion to the Blessed Sacrament manifested in the Congress and in the struggle for the Mass in West Clare just after the Famine.

Three well-known works have now appeared in a cheaper edition. They are Fr. Cuthbert's *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*,¹² Fr. Martindale's *Words of the Missal*,¹³ and Abbot Butler's *Ways of Christian Life*.¹⁴

Some recent French works, worthy of note, are: *Le Cardinal de Bérulle*, which gathers into one volume some of the best of his writings; *Écrits Spirituels* (I—*Conférences*) of the late Père de Grandmaison, S.J., collected by a disciple, a very valuable book, because of the author's competence in matters spiritual, especially in the very difficult matter of knowing how to spiritualize without destroying; *Le Dépouillement*, by Abbé J. Leclercq, which explains clearly and wisely the principles and

⁹ By Fergal McGrath, S.J. (Gill and Son, Dublin; 2s.).

¹⁰ By the Most Rev. Joseph Busch, D.D., Bishop of St. Cloud (Washbourne and Bogan, Ltd.; 3s. 6d.).

¹¹ By Fr. Jerome O'Callaghan, O.F.M. 56 pages. Sands, 6d.

¹² Slightly abridged. Longmans, 5s.

¹³ Sheed and Ward. 2s. 6d. See a review in the CLERGY REVIEW, Aug., 1932.

¹⁴ Sheed and Ward, 3s. 6d. Reviewed in the CLERGY REVIEW, Sept., 1932.

the practice of asceticism; *Catéchisme de la Vie Chrétienne*, giving in the form of a catechism the theology of the religious and the spiritual life; written by a Dominican, it follows the principles of St. Thomas; the author teaches the necessity of an "attrait" in religious vocation. *Vie et Pensées de Mère Gertrude* details the life and educative work of one who was a born educationalist. A Breton by birth, she joined St. Peter Fourier's Congrégation de Notre Dame. After the laws against religious in France she was in exile with her community at Westgate in Kent, where she died in 1918.

III. HISTORY.

BY THE REV. PHILIP HUGHES, Lic.Sc.Hist.

Anyone who has read Dom David Knowles's study of St. Wulstan of Worcester in *The English Way* will agree that few of God's servants make such an immediate appeal to our affectionate veneration. If with this picture in mind they turn next to the life by his most recent biographer—*St. Wulstan Prelate and Patriot*, by John W. Lamb, M.A.¹—they will suffer something of a disappointment. For Mr. Lamb's book is dreadfully dull. It is based on sources and these are quoted on every page of his full and detailed account. But the subject never comes to life, it is as dead as any carefully described curio in a museum. The author's attitude towards the miraculous is unscientific. Not that he denies the possibility of miracles, but when faced with them he will neither affirm nor deny according to the evidence, preferring to describe them with a remark about the "credulity" of the eye-witnesses for sole comment. Thus, to quote two examples, a workman repairing a church falls forty feet to the ground, St. Wulstan sees him and as he falls blesses him with the sign of the cross, and the man is unharmed. "The credulous people attributed the man's miraculous escape to the presence of Wulstan. . . ." The famous story of the pastoral staff is well known: how, when the Conqueror ordered the saint to resign he thrust it into the stone over St. Edward's tomb, resigning only to the king thanks to whom he had been appointed. There the crozier stayed. Wulstan would not move it, no other man could, and the king, convinced of his sanctity, allowed him to retain his see. Truth or legend, the one point to be accepted or rejected is the incident of the miracle. Mr. Lamb tries, in the manner of the sympathetic criticism, to empty out the whole value of the event while keeping as much as can be kept of its circumstances. So that, in his own words, "the miraculous episode of the pastoral staff might be reduced to reasonable proportions. The legend, therefore, resolves itself into William I attempting to depose Wulstan who, ready to comply, placed his pastoral

¹ S.P.C.K., pp. 218, 8s. 6d.

staff upon the tomb of his former patron: but by courage and piety he won the friendship of King William and was commanded by the King to retain his see." Finally, we must confess to a little anxiety about the competence of an author whose work is based on Latin manuscripts and who is responsible for such extraordinary translation as "They said his practice of religion almost eclipsed the precepts of it" to render "Dum anticiparet exemplo quod praedicaret verbo," or, who, more amazingly still, for "Obedientia que exhibetur praelatis exhiberi deo sacris informamur eloquiis. Ipse enim dicit qui vos audit: me audit" gives "The obedience which is delivered by bishops, we are informed is to be shown by solemn words before God. Indeed, he who hears me, says he hears you." By this time the schoolmaster would have flung the grammar book at the head of the unlucky construer! It is astonishing to find "*The Church Historical Society*" letting such slipshod work pass out under its name, and, at the price, the book is very dear.

Elizabeth, Queen of England, by Milton Waldman,² is one of those books which it is not too unkind to describe as distantly descended in left-handed fashion from Mr. Lytton Strachey. "One is made to love . . . this strange hard and pitiful woman," say the publishers. What really has the author to tell us of Elizabeth that we do not already know? What are his credentials that we should accept his account? There is, to begin with, not a single reference, in support of the book's assertions, to any of the innumerable sources listed in the bibliography. In that list are two very remarkable omissions. It includes neither (the Protestant) Meyer's great work *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth* nor Fr. Pollen's *The English Catholics under Elizabeth*. For a writer to quote Froude and Pollard as his chief guides and to confess ignorance of these two studies rules out his work immediately from consideration as serious history. As for the manner "The Roman statesmen, whose contemporary record of imbecility was already sufficiently brilliant, outdid themselves in their treatment of Anne Boleyn's daughter" (p. 43). The martyrdoms are, of course, "reprisals" for the assassination plots, the instruments for which "were supplied by the Society of Jesus" (p. 280), the priests being "sent to preach not only religion but sedition, to assist in it, and to accomplish the death of the Queen if that would further their mission; the supreme reward of canonization was promised them by the Church if they themselves died in the attempt" (p. 282). It is with unpleasant astonishment that one notes the respectable name of Longmans on this latest contribution to the literature of anti-Catholic slander.

Mr. Belloc's *Charles the First*³ is a welcome addition to his growing series of biographical studies. It is, to begin with,

² Longmans, pp. 328, 125, 6d.

³ Cassell, pp. 366, 16s.

the practice of asceticism; *Catéchisme de la Vie Chrétienne*, giving in the form of a catechism the theology of the religious and the spiritual life; written by a Dominican, it follows the principles of St. Thomas; the author teaches the necessity of an "attrait" in religious vocation. *Vie et Pensées de Mère Gertrude* details the life and educative work of one who was a born educationalist. A Breton by birth, she joined St. Peter Fourier's Congrégation de Notre Dame. After the laws against religious in France she was in exile with her community at Westgate in Kent, where she died in 1918.

III. HISTORY.

BY THE REV. PHILIP HUGHES, Lic.Sc.Hist.

Anyone who has read Dom David Knowles's study of St. Wulstan of Worcester in *The English Way* will agree that few of God's servants make such an immediate appeal to our affectionate veneration. If with this picture in mind they turn next to the life by his most recent biographer—*St. Wulstan Prelate and Patriot*, by John W. Lamb, M.A.¹—they will suffer something of a disappointment. For Mr. Lamb's book is dreadfully dull. It is based on sources and these are quoted on every page of his full and detailed account. But the subject never comes to life, it is as dead as any carefully described curio in a museum. The author's attitude towards the miraculous is unscientific. Not that he denies the possibility of miracles, but when faced with them he will neither affirm nor deny according to the evidence, preferring to describe them with a remark about the "credulity" of the eye-witnesses for sole comment. Thus, to quote two examples, a workman repairing a church falls forty feet to the ground, St. Wulstan sees him and as he falls blesses him with the sign of the cross, and the man is unharmed. "The credulous people attributed the man's miraculous escape to the presence of Wulstan. . . ." The famous story of the pastoral staff is well known: how, when the Conqueror ordered the saint to resign he thrust it into the stone over St. Edward's tomb, resigning only to the king thanks to whom he had been appointed. There the crozier stayed. Wulstan would not move it, no other man could, and the king, convinced of his sanctity, allowed him to retain his see. Truth or legend, the one point to be accepted or rejected is the incident of the miracle. Mr. Lamb tries, in the manner of the sympathetic criticism, to empty out the whole value of the event while keeping as much as can be kept of its circumstances. So that, in his own words, "the miraculous episode of the pastoral staff might be reduced to reasonable proportions. The legend, therefore, resolves itself into William I attempting to depose Wulstan who, ready to comply, placed his pastoral

¹ S.P.C.K., pp. 218, 8s. 6d.

staff upon the tomb of his former patron: but by courage and piety he won the friendship of King William and was commanded by the King to retain his see." Finally, we must confess to a little anxiety about the competence of an author whose work is based on Latin manuscripts and who is responsible for such extraordinary translation as "They said his practice of religion almost eclipsed the precepts of it" to render "Dum anticiparet exemplo quod praedicaret verbo," or, who, more amazingly still, for "Obediencia que exhibetur praelatis exhiberi deo sacris informamur eloquiis. Ipse enim dicit qui vos audit: me audit" gives "The obedience which is delivered by bishops, we are informed is to be shown by solemn words before God. Indeed, he who hears me, says he hears you." By this time the schoolmaster would have flung the grammar book at the head of the unlucky construer! It is astonishing to find "*The Church Historical Society*" letting such slipshod work pass out under its name, and, at the price, the book is very dear.

Elizabeth, Queen of England, by Milton Waldman,² is one of those books which it is not too unkind to describe as distantly descended in left-handed fashion from Mr. Lytton Strachey. "One is made to love . . . this strange hard and pitiful woman," say the publishers. What really has the author to tell us of Elizabeth that we do not already know? What are his credentials that we should accept his account? There is, to begin with, not a single reference, in support of the book's assertions, to any of the innumerable sources listed in the bibliography. In that list are two very remarkable omissions. It includes neither (the Protestant) Meyer's great work *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth* nor Fr. Pollen's *The English Catholics under Elizabeth*. For a writer to quote Froude and Pollard as his chief guides and to confess ignorance of these two studies rules out his work immediately from consideration as serious history. As for the manner "The Roman statesmen, whose contemporary record of imbecility was already sufficiently brilliant, outdid themselves in their treatment of Anne Boleyn's daughter" (p. 43). The martyrdoms are, of course, "reprisals" for the assassination plots, the instruments for which "were supplied by the Society of Jesus" (p. 280), the priests being "sent to preach not only religion but sedition, to assist in it, and to accomplish the death of the Queen if that would further their mission; the supreme reward of canonization was promised them by the Church if they themselves died in the attempt" (p. 282). It is with unpleasant astonishment that one notes the respectable name of Longmans on this latest contribution to the literature of anti-Catholic slander.

Mr. Belloc's *Charles the First*³ is a welcome addition to his growing series of biographical studies. It is, to begin with,

² Longmans, pp. 328, 12s. 6d.

³ Cassell, pp. 366, 16s.

admirably written. There is not a misused word nor a loose sentence in all its three hundred or so pages. And, of course, it is alive with definite challenging statement, intelligent analysis and vivid description. His point of view is his own, and, once more, it is not urged on the strength of any sensational discovery of new facts. Mr. Belloc, and not so much in the manner of the advocate as of the judge, here sets down the King's side of the story with the much more familiar account given by his enemies and the heirs to their success. He stands away from the complete picture and describes *all* he sees. The nature and rôle of Parliament as Charles and his predecessors for centuries had known them—a different kind of thing from what subsequent generations were to call by the same name; the incredible sudden poverty of the Crown—that is, as we should say, of the national government—due to economic world conditions; the simultaneous growth of a new class so wealthy that it threatened to overtop the King as, centuries before, the feudal baronage had similarly menaced him; the insistence of the Parliament that the peace policy of James I be reversed, and its refusal to vote the necessary funds; the King's increasing determination that the wealth of the country should carry its fair share of the national burden, and his increasing realization that Wealth was determined rather to be master of the realm—these are Mr. Belloc's themes. His book, to judge by the ultimate fate of most of his ideas, that began to live giped at for their eccentricity, will no doubt do much to change popular ideas on one of the most important crises of English history.

Mr. Evan John, too, writes on *King Charles I.*⁴ His method differs from the dramatic exposition of Mr. Belloc. He follows the King's career year by year from his birth at Dunfermline to the scaffold at Whitehall, and though he does not write with the practised skill of the older man he has produced a study of real distinction. Not the least interesting thing about it is his agreement—save for a few details—with Mr. Belloc, for Mr. John, too, sees the King as the champion of the Nation against a faction. He has more facts, is more generous in significant detail, has an interesting note on sources and a thoroughly sane idea of what History is and what are its limitations. "[Charles] was not destroyed by some monstrous abstraction called the Evolution of England: he fell because at definite moments he and his servants made definite errors, some moral, some mere miscalculations. It would be absurd to pretend that at three centuries' distance, we can point an unerring finger at the particular mistakes which ruined him. Perhaps a forgotten word, a mere glance or expression of face, may have been more disastrous than all the Orders and Proclamations that survive." The reminder is useful.

With the third book before us to deal with seventeenth century England—*John Hampden*, by Hugh Ross Williamson⁵—

⁴ Arthur Barker, pp. 314, 10s.

⁵ Hodder & Stoughton, pp. 360, 12s. 6d.

we return to the old story, the Macaulay-Carlyle-Green tradition to whose dilapidation in recent years the two last books bear witness. Nor is the author this time really happy in his hero who, for all the devotion lavished on him, never comes to life. "If, to-day, Englishmen held a public carnival to celebrate the murder of the War Minister, and then proceeded at intervals to execute the Prime Minister, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the King, the question would surely be rather: 'What on earth have those eminent men done to come to such an end?' than 'Why has the nation been seized with a fit of abominable criminality?'," writes Mr. Williamson in his preface. Upon which one feels inclined to say that the author who thus *a priori* identifies either the London mob of the seventeenth century or the Parliamentary faction responsible for the death of Laud and Strafford, or Cromwell and his highly-paid army of looters and butchers with the Nation, has no business writing history at all. However, there the three books are for all men's comparison.

A book of well-written letters is always a delight, and when we are offered a collection whose author is a Catholic of penal days, who suffered much for his faith, fines and imprisonment and fines again, the thing seems too good to be true. Such a collection, however, is "*Cavalier, Letters of William Blundell to his Friends 1620-1698*", edited now by Margaret Blundell.⁶ In the correspondence of this valiant Lancashire squire we see the seventeenth century from yet another angle. He fought for the King, despite the recusancy fines, during the Civil War, and was badly wounded at the siege of Lancaster. Loyally he gave his plate to be melted down to help on the cause, and though his sequestered estates were restored at the Restoration, he still had to pay the ruinous fines for refusing to attend the Protestant services, and to endure the humiliation of surrendering his sword, because a Catholic, to one who in the war had fought for the rebels. The "Popish Plot" of 1679 drove him once more into exile, and an old man of seventy-five, he was, with several of his Catholic neighbours, tried for his life at Manchester in 1695 on a trumped-up charge of plotting the death of Dutch William. The letters give a lively picture of the home life of the family, the straits to which they were put to exercise their religion, the relations with the convents overseas in which more than one of the women dedicated themselves to God, the strong reserved English piety of these heroic souls who never suspected the quality of their virtue. The squire's son, Nicholas, was a Jesuit at the time of the Popish Plot, resident in London, where, by stealth, he passed his life in the service of the prisoners in Newgate. In the detail of Oates' malignant scare he figures as the priest commissioned to burn down London again. The book is one to read and to read again, to buy and keep. It is the domestic side of the martyrs' lives described by one of their kin.

⁶ Longmans, pp. 327, 10s. 6d.

A compact and very useful book is *The Catholic Martyrs of Wales*,⁸ by T. P. Ellis. There is a full bibliography (which, however, makes no mention of the first official list of the martyrs drawn up in England by Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, nor among modern works of Arnold Oscar Meyer's great work on the Church under Elizabeth) and then follow the short summary biographies. In Part I—"The Major Victims"—they are classified by reigns, thirty-seven in all between 1535 and 1680. Part II gives accounts of another thirty-one victims of the persecution regarding whom no process has been instituted. To each biography a note of the sources is appended. As one reads these accounts the combination of heroism, holiness and all the characteristics of a familiar people make one wonder more and more why, in an age where popular piety runs so easily to the honouring of saints, these our own martyrs come so slowly to their own. Blessed Richard Gwynn, one of the most noble figures of all, writer of poems and carols, the proto-martyr of Wales, was fixed in the town stocks ten hours together and "vexed all the time with a rabble of ministers." One of them, a red-nosed Stiggins, argued himself as good as St. Peter. He, too, had received the keys. "Obviously those of the beer cellar," said the prisoner, for which he was fined 100 marks, and again, with undismayed humour, when his fines reached £2,500, he remarked he had "somewhat towards it." "How much," asked the judge. "Sixpence." Few martyrs had so much to suffer in their actual death as this learned and merry-humoured schoolmaster whom Pius XI beatified three years ago. Mr. Ellis has rendered a great service surely to the conversion of Wales by this reminder of Welsh heroism in the cause of the Faith.

Two books by Mr. Joseph Clayton, F.R.Hist.S., call for notice, a life of *St. Anselm*⁹ and a study of *Sir Thomas More*.¹⁰ The first is a simple narrative of the life of one of the greatest of mediæval saints and thinkers who, inexplicably, still awaits his real biographer. Mr. Clayton's little book tells very vividly the story of his varied life, monk at Bec, abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, philosopher, theologian and staunch champion of the Church's liberties before two tyrannical English kings, forerunner of St. Thomas of Canterbury and St. Thomas Aquinas alike. The *Sir Thomas More* is a book of quite a different character, not a short life of the great Lord Chancellor, but a series of studies in which, successively, the husband and father, the man of letters, the judge and the martyr are set before the reader. Mr. Clayton shows himself well acquainted with Blessed Thomas More's works and not the least valuable part of his study is the generous quotations from them which illustrate it.

While the centenary of the Oxford Movement has in England

⁸ Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., pp. 200, 5s.

⁹ The Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, pp. 159, \$1.75.

¹⁰ Burns Oates & Washbourne, pp. 144, 3s. 6d.

been occupying the thoughts of those interested in religious history, Catholics across the channel have been recalling a contemporary event of a much more dolorous character—the apostasy of La Mennais. In *Lettres de Montalembert à La Mennais*,¹¹ Mlle. de Lallemand, whose studies of Montalembert are part of the classic literature of the subject, publishes, with M. Georges Goyau, 116 letters of Montalembert to the unfortunate man who, at the beginning of the correspondence (the autumn of 1832) “Mon bien aimé père,” is by the end (May, 1836) no more than “Mon très cher ami.” Two months later the young count was to receive from La Mennais that letter which still bears in red his tragic endorsement “La dernière.” In these letters of Montalembert the tragedy steadily reveals itself, the tragedy of a soul tried by forces beyond its understanding and to which, until it can understand, it refuses obedience, all the time protesting its loyalty to that to which it refuses to submit. All the beauty of Montalembert’s youth is here—he was but twenty-one when the first letter was written—all his generous soul, his affectionate eloquence, his concern for the future of his “bien aimé père” now preparing to throw himself headlong into the gulf. What a tragedy this spiritual suicide of the man to whom the whole Church had so recently looked as to the God-sent prophet of the new age, the Cardinal *in petto*, it is said, of Leo XII’s creation! What a tragedy, and what an age of general intellectual insufficiency it recalls, the age when the ancient schools of Philosophy and Theology had been destroyed and their tradition broken, when the world of the Thomist renaissance was yet to come, the age in which, if Newman came to a Catholicism which was long in understanding him, La Mennais left a Catholicism he had never really known at all. To this rich collection M. Georges Goyau contributes a lengthy introduction in which, with fitting talent, he gives these wonderful letters their appropriate setting. Two portraits and three indexes complete the book.

¹¹ Desclée, Paris, pp. 321.

MORAL CASES

COMMUNION BEFORE MASS.

May a parish priest insist on the faithful receiving Holy Communion immediately after the priest's communion during Mass, instead of immediately before Mass, except only in the case of persons who have a good reason for communicating at this less correct time. (V.C.)

REPLY.

The normal rule is that the faithful should communicate during Mass. This is certainly the tradition of the Church and may even be said to represent the mind of Christ: "accipite ex eo omnes." The *Postcommunion* prayer of the Mass presupposes and takes for granted that the faithful have just received Holy Communion. "Excitentur fideles ut frequenter, etiam quotidie . . . utque Missae adstantes non solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali etiam sanctissimae Eucharistiae perceptione, rite dispositi, communicent" (Canon 863). Also, Canon 846, §1 expresses the normal rule: "Quilibet sacerdos intra Missam et, si privatim celebrat, etiam proxime ante et statim post, sacram communionem ministrare potest, salvo praescripto can. 869." The exception for a "private" Mass establishes the rule for Masses which are not private; Canon 869 permits the distribution of Holy Communion in any place where Mass may be lawfully said. The practice of receiving Holy Communion just before Mass needs special consideration, because the priest is vested for Mass and the rite has the appearance of being connected with Mass. It is open to any priest to point out repeatedly to the people the importance of the normal liturgical rule.

But there have always been occasions, even in ancient practice, when the Holy Eucharist could be received outside of Mass, on the supposition that there existed some necessity for it. The practice has undoubtedly spread to cases where there is really no shadow of necessity whatever. This abuse the Church has checked by forbidding the practice of communicating before Mass, except only in Masses styled "private."¹ Unfortunately the term *Missa Privata* can be used in more than one sense: it can imply a Mass at which the faithful are not invited to be present, for example, a Mass in a private oratory or a non-official Mass said by a visiting priest in a church; it can also, and this is the commonest sense, imply a Mass which is not a High Mass nor a *Missa Cantata* nor a *Conventual Mass*.² It is in this latter sense that the terms of Canon 846, §1 are to be

¹ Can. 846, §1 is also the rubric in the *Roman Ritual*, Tit IV, c.1 n.13.

² Cf. *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1921, XVIII, p. 427.

interpreted, as may be deduced from a reply of the S.C.R. "... non potest administrare S. Communionem, etiam data rationabili causa, ante vel post Missam solemnem aut cantatam aut etiam conventualem, sicut permittitur ante vel post missam privatam."³

I think, therefore, it must be admitted that, as long as the modern custom of communicating before Mass is not expressly forbidden, the faithful who seek communion at this time must be presumed to have a reasonable cause. They are seeking the sacraments reasonably and are not to be refused, except only in the cases mentioned by the reply of the S.C.R. A priest may speak against the custom as much as he chooses, and exhort the faithful to communicate during Mass, provided that he expresses his willingness to give communion to people who present themselves at the less correct time. "Intra missam communio populi statim post communionem sacerdotis celebrantis fieri debet (nisi quandoque ex rationabili causa proxime ante vel statim post missam privatam sit facienda").⁴ "Haec rationabilis causa adest quando fideles petunt."⁵

E. J. M.

DEACON ADMINISTERING HOLY COMMUNION.

It sometimes happens that a deacon is staying in this place, and it would often be convenient if he could administer Holy Communion to the faithful. What is a sufficient reason for permitting this? What rite is to be observed and, in particular, should he give the blessing at the end? May he also communicate himself? (R.)

REPLY.

(1) "(minister) extraordinarius est diaconus, de Ordinarii loci vel parochi licentia, gravi de causa concedenda, quae in casu necessitatis legitime praesumitur."¹ The canon expresses the ancient discipline of the Church implied in the Ordination rite: "Et quia comministri et cooperatores estis Corporis et Sanguinis Domini, estote ab omni illecebra carnis alieni. . . ." Permission is to be sought from the parish priest, who will use his judgment in deciding that a grave cause exists, but this permission is presumed in cases of necessity. The administration of *viaticum* is an obvious case of necessity in which he not only may, but should administer the Holy Eucharist without seeking permission.

Previous to the Code, the writers on the subject generally relied on a decree of the S.C.R., February 25th, 1777,² which

³ *Decreta Authentica*, n. 4177, p. 3; *Collationes Brugenses*, 1933, p. 284.

⁴ *Rit Rom.*, Tit IV, cap. ii, n. 11.

⁵ *Collat. Brug.*, ib., p. 283.

¹ Can. 845, §2.

² *Decreta Authentica*, n. 2504.

authorized a deacon to distribute Holy Communion only *in casu necessitatis*, whereas now, from Canon 845, §2, there is a distinction between "necessity" and "grave reason." No doubt it could be decided that there may be other cases of necessity, apart from the administration of *viaticum* but I have not found any author who explicitly teaches that a deacon may administer Holy Communion, without permission, in other cases. The fulfilment of the paschal precept would seem to be one other example. A parish priest lawfully gives permission in cases which are very much less than necessity, for example, if a priest needs assistance in communicating a large congregation, or if he is absent at a time when Holy Communion has been announced, or if the faithful would otherwise be deprived of Holy Communion desired *devotionis causa*.

(2) When the latest typical edition of the *Rituale Romanum* appeared, it was directed that a deacon administering Holy Communion should observe the rite as set out in the Ritual.³ Even before this edition it was agreed that, in administering Holy Communion to the sick, he should give a blessing with the ciborium to the sick person and also to the faithful after returning to the Church. But there was considerable doubt and hesitation as to whether he should give the usual blessing with the hand when administering Holy Communion in a church outside of Mass. This question is really solved by Cap. 2, n. 10 of the *Rituale Romanum* and a reply of the Codex Commission⁴ removed all remaining doubt by answering in the affirmative: "potest et debet."

(3) He may also communicate himself, a corollary from the solution given in the November issue, page 412.

E. J. M.

FACULTIES FOR GRANTING INDULGENCES.

With regard to the recent decree of the Sacred Penitentiary (March 20th, 1933), by which the privileges granted to priest members of certain Associations are withdrawn, may we conclude that the law is not retrospective, i.e., the Associations in question may not grant these privileges to future members but the existing members retain the powers they possess? (P.B.)

REPLY.

The essential paragraph of the decree is as follows: *Concessionones omnes et singulae, piis fidelium associationibus cuiuscumque nominis vel naturae, etsi forte sacerdotibus tantum constantibus, quovis loco aut tempore seu modo vel titulo hucusque factae, largiendi privatis sacerdotibus facultates et indultae quae sequuntur . . . praesenti Decreto revocantur, abrogantur atque omnino abolentur ita ut ab huius ipsius*

³ Tit. IV, cap. 2, n. 10; cap. 4, n. 28.

⁴ July 13th, 1930.

Decreti evulgationis die omni prorsus vi careant omnique efficacia destituantur." The text has been widely reprinted in various periodicals, and its general character is so sweeping and complete that there would appear to be, at first sight, no room for doubts arising in its interpretation. It came into force not on March 20th but on April 1st, the date of its promulgation in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*. It abrogates only the privileges expressly mentioned, namely, of attaching to religious articles the Apostolic or Bridgettine Indulgences, of enriching rosaries with the same, of attaching to crucifixes the Indulgences of the Stations of the Cross or a plenary indulgence at the hour of death, of bestowing the papal blessing at the end of sermons, and the indult of a personal privileged altar. All or any of these faculties, formerly obtained by virtue of joining an Association, such as the *Catholic Truth Society*, can no longer be secured in this simple way. In future, priests who desire them must send a petition to the Holy See through their Ordinaries. Faculties already obtained by individuals directly from the Sacred Penitentiary are not affected by the decree.

The correct answer to the question, which has been very widely raised by the clergy, is in the affirmative. A careful reading of the text reveals that the object-matter of the abrogation is "Concessionones largiendi privatis sacerdotibus facultates, etc."; it does not say that faculties already lawfully obtained are withdrawn, but that the power to concede these privileges is abrogated. This is the solution given by Dr. Bentley in this REVIEW, Vol. VI, pages 73 and 165; in *Perfice Munus*, June 1st, 1933, page 448, by an anonymous writer; and in *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, June, 1933, page 542, by the well-known canonist, Fr. Creusen, S.J. "Mais, et la chose est à noter soigneusement, les pouvoirs obtenus par l'intermédiaire de ces Instituts religieux ou de ces Associations avant le 1^{er} Avril de cette année ne sont point retirés. Tous les prêtres qui le possédaient à cette date peuvent donc continuer à en faire usage." Maroto states in *Apollinaris*, 1933, page 173, that this is the mind of the *Sacred Penitentiary*. Pending an official interpretation in a contrary sense, this solution may be safely adopted by all the priest members of such Associations. Cf. also *Collationes Brug.*, 1933, page 227; *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1933, page 644.

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

RESPONSES OF THE CODE COMMISSION.

The Pontifical Commission for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code issued the following Responses on July 17th, 1933 (A.A.S., XXV, p. 345). We give first a short explanation, then the text of the decree.

(i.) *Power to Authenticate Sacred Relics (cc. 1283, 1285).*

No relic may be exposed for public veneration unless it is authenticated by a Cardinal, or the local Ordinary, or an ecclesiastic to whom the faculty of authenticating relics has been granted by apostolic indult (c. 1283). If the document of authentication is lost through any cause, the relic must be withdrawn until a fresh approbation is secured (c. 1285).

In law, the Vicar General comes under the designation of *Ordinarius loci* in all matters, unless an explicit exception is made (c. 198). The Code, however, expressly declares that he may not authenticate relics without a special mandate (c. 1283, §2); nor, without a special mandate, does his favourable judgment suffice where there is a question of renewing an authentication which has been lost (c. 1285, §1).

In reply to queries concerning the exact force of these restrictions, the Code Commission declares that, without a mandate from the Bishop, the Vicar General may not authenticate even a part detached from a relic which has been approved; and that, failing such mandate, he may neither renew a document which has been lost, nor attach a new seal.

The response makes the phrase "*de mandato speciali*" clearer by adding "*Episcopi*." Other ecclesiastics require a *Papal* indult.

Qu. "I. An Vicarius generalis, ad normam canonis 1283 §2, speciali mandato Episcopi indigeat ad authenticandam partem sacrae reliquiae ex authentica extractam. II. An Vicarius generalis, vi canonis 1285 §1, sine speciali mandato Episcopi novum authenticitatis documentum tradere vel sacrae reliquiae novum sigillum apponere possit."

R. "Ad I. *Affirmative*. Ad II. *Negative*."

(ii.) *The Right to Impugn a Marriage (c. 1971).*

The right in any ecclesiastical court to challenge the validity of a marriage is restricted by canon 1971 to the interested pair and the Promoter of Justice. The former forfeit their right "if they are themselves the cause of the impediment."

In virtue of a response given on March 12th, 1929, the word *impediment* is here to be taken in an extended sense. It covers impediments properly so called, i.e., those which directly affect persons (cc. 1067-1080), and also impediments in the wider

pre-Code sense, including those connected with the form (cc. 1081-1093) and the consent (cc. 1094-1103). Cf. Gasparri, *Tractatus Canonicus de Matrimonio* (1932), n. 1260: "Casus huiusmodi evenire solent in impedimento *criminis*, in defectu formae substantialis, in conditione apposita contra substantiam, in metu gravi incusso ab una parte ut altera pars in matrimonium consentiat."

The present response clears up certain difficulties surrounding another vital word. What, precisely, is the meaning of *causa* in this context? According to the canonists, the whole clause "nisi ipsi fuerint impedimenti causa" must be understood as denying the favour of the law to the *guilty* party. The innocent retain their right. Cf. Gasparri, *loc. cit.*: "Ius accusandi matrimonium competit coniugibus ex iure naturae, ideoque huius privatio sapit poenam, quae non concipitur sine culpa. Dedecet enim coniuges, qui mala fide causa fuerunt impedimenti et consequenter nullitatis matrimonii, ex culpabili actione commodum reportare." With this explanation, the reason for the latest reply of the Code Commission will be readily understood.

In the first place, a feigned assent given under compulsion, although it renders the marriage null, does not thereby involve a woman who thus consents in any guilt. It would be unreasonable to consider her the responsible cause of an invalid marriage in the sense required by canon 1971.

Conversely, one who is the *culpable* cause of an impediment (or of the nullity of a marriage in the case of "quasi-impediments"), is not admitted as *actor* or *actrix* in the ecclesiastical court. At most, such a one may "denounce" the marriage, in accordance with canon 1971 §2, as explained in a response of July 20th, 1929.

Where, however, a free agent has induced an impediment by an act which is good and lawful, he does not forfeit the favour of the law.

Lastly, the *Promotor Iustitiae*, once he is appointed by the Ordinary, acts henceforth *ex officio*, and may exercise the faculty granted by canon 1971 without seeking a special mandate.

Qu. "I. An, ad normam canonis 1971 §1, n. 1, habilis sit ad accusandum matrimonium coniux, qui metum aut coactionem passus sit.

"II. An, ad normam eiusdem canonis 1971 §1, n. 1, habilis sit ad accusandum matrimonium etiam coniux, qui fuerit causa culpabilis sive impedimenti sive nullitatis matrimonii.

"III. An causa impedimenti honesta et licita a coniuge apposita obstat quominus coniux ipse habilis sit ad accusandum matrimonium, ad normam canonis 1971 §1, n. 1.

"IV. An, vi canonis 1971 §2, promotor iustitiae vi muneris sui agat in iudicio."

R. "Ad I. *Affirmative*. Ad II. *Negative*. Ad III. *Negative*. Ad IV. *Affirmative*."

CONDITIONS FOR GAINING INDULGENCES.

An authentic *Declaration* of the Sacred Penitentiary, dated September 20th, 1933, solves the doubt as to what is meant by the following clauses, so often added in the grant of indulgences—"a visit to a church, public oratory, or, for those who may lawfully use it, semi-public oratory," and "prayers for the intentions of the Sovereign Pontiff" (A.A.S., XXV, p. 446).

(a) By a *visit to a church* is to be understood "going to a church, public oratory or, for those lawfully using it, semi-public oratory, at least with some general or implicit intention of honouring God in Himself or in His Saints, and adding a prayer—in fact, the prescribed prayer, if any has been imposed by the grantor of the indulgence; otherwise any oral or even mental prayer in accordance with one's piety and devotion."

(b) The condition of *praying for the Pope's intention* "is adequately fulfilled if we add to other prescribed works the recital of one *Pater*, *Ave* and *Gloria* for that intention; although each person is left free, in view of canon 934, §1, to say any other prayer in accordance with his piety and devotion towards the Roman Pontiff." Canon 934, §1, lays it down that mental prayer does not here suffice, but that vocal prayers may be chosen at will, provided that in a particular case no special prayer has been assigned. The new ruling does not affect the *toties quoties* plenary indulgences attached to a visit to a church on the feast of Portiuncula or All Souls, for which six *Paters*, six *Aves* and six *Glorias* have been assigned in a recent decree. It will affect the "En ego" and similar prayers.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Liturgical Altar. By Geoffrey Webb. (Washbourne and Bogan, Ltd. 5s. net.)

Directions for the Use of Altar Societies and Architects. New Edition Revised and Enlarged. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 2s. 6d.)

It should be obvious to all that the altar, the very reason for the existence of a church, is the focal point of the whole liturgy. The ancient laws contained in the General Rubrics of the Missal, the Pontifical, the Ritual, and the Ceremonial, together with the more recent prescriptions of Canon Law, reveal the anxiety of the Church to preserve the sacred character and the decorum of the site of the Sacrifice and the shrine of the Presence. Since its institution in 1588, the Congregation of Sacred Rites has issued numerous decrees, always referring back to the original directions, to correct abuses and deviations. Slight concessions have been granted from time to time, in consideration of such local difficulties as poverty, but always with grudging tolerance. In that period of wild enthusiasm for the ideals of pagan art which we call the Renaissance, the ancient laws and traditions were ostentatiously disregarded, and the depressing influence has not yet been completely dispersed.

From the many irregularities and artificialities which still flourish to offend the eyes of the liturgically-minded, it would seem that even the obvious can be overlooked. Nevertheless, the liturgical revival of our own time is quietly working for reform, and in many of our modern churches the altars are models of correct liturgical construction and good taste. The lapses of our brethren of a generation or two ago were due not to deliberate disobedience, but, on the one hand, to uncertainty as to the official directions, and, on the other, to the assumption that the long-standing examples of continental churches were necessarily in the right. As Mr. Geoffrey Webb points out, after the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act local tradition had to start practically from zero. Side by side with haphazard borrowing from contemporary Italian, French, and Irish examples came the effort of Pugin to reintroduce the traditions of mediæval England.

Architects erred in ignorance. Nearly a hundred years ago, that painstaking antiquary, Dr. Rock, raised a lonely voice of protest. He complained bitterly that through ignorance of English ecclesiastical antiquity and of rubrics still in force, architects were striving to foist on to English Catholic churches all kinds of foreign exaggerations in which mere prettiness outweighed becoming ornament.

Mr. Webb's excellent little book would be worthy of the highest commendation if it served no other purpose than to

supply in a handy and inexpensive form a summary of the directions and corrective decrees for the benefit of those who, as he declares, constantly urge the difficulty of finding them as an excuse for non-observance. But the book is much more than that. The second chapter covers a brief but thoroughly comprehensive history of the Christian altar. Particular attention is devoted to the English mediæval altar. The majestic stone canopy, ciborium magnum or civory, of Roman origin was never wholly abandoned in Italy and Southern Europe. In the north it was replaced by other arrangements in accordance with architectural developments. In England the graceful scheme of tester and ridel posts became almost universal. This was not, however, as Mr. Webb appears to think, an exclusively English system. It was driven out of France by the extravagances of neo-classicism. Even so, it survived in pseudo-classical style until the eighteenth century, if one may judge from an engraving published in *Caeremoniale Parisienne*, in 1703.

Mr. Webb's photographs of modern altars, including some of his own designing, in which this dignified arrangement has been revived, are thoroughly convincing. The present form of tabernacle was introduced too late to be adopted here before the change of religion. The hanging pyx was the ordinary vessel of Reservation in use in England. This comely appurtenance which some imagine to be forbidden, has continued in use at Amiens and Grottoferata, and in at least one instance has been revived in a modern English church. By far the longest and most important chapter is the one entitled, Rubrics Referring to the Altar and its Canopy. The pious reader must be prepared for shocks. He will be horrified to discover what a number of abominations of desolation still stand in the holy place, although distinctly forbidden, and what a number of obligatory directions continue to be disregarded.

Directions for the Use of Altar Societies and Architects is too well known to need recommendation. Messrs. Burns Oates and Washbourne have done well to publish an up-to-date edition. The book is full of practical information, and a copy should be kept in every sacristy.

J. P. REDMOND.

The Life of St. John the Baptist. By the Very Rev. Denis Buzy. Freely adapted by the Rev. John M. T. Barton, D.D., L.S.S. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. pp. 283. 7s. 6d.)

Dr. Barton has rendered a valuable service to students of the New Testament by giving us this abridged and adapted English version of Père Buzy's classic study *Saint Jean-Baptiste*. By omitting much of Buzy's topographical and theological matter and all his treatment of the historical value of the Gospel-narrative, Dr. Barton has considerably reduced the original, thus making his version more exclusively a life of the Baptist. The wisdom of this curtailment will scarcely be questioned.

The English version contains much new matter, sometimes in re-written paragraphs, but usually in compressed editorial

footnotes. In these we get all the important findings of the best studies of St. John which have appeared since the latest edition of Buzy's work in 1922. To Buzy's bibliography Dr. Barton has added an excellent supplementary list.

Three chapters on the Baptist's early life, five on his ministry, and four on his last days form the major portion of the book. In each chapter the pertinent Gospel-passages are set forth in a translation of Dr. Barton's own; there follows a full discussion of the main questions involved. Many of these might well be termed *Quaestiones Disputatae*; indeed, it is only from a study such as this that one can realize how many difficulties beset the exegete of the Gospel-account of the Baptist. This is not the place to discuss the value of the views adopted by Buzy, or by Dr. Barton when he differs from his author. Suffice to say that the opinions deemed less probable are presented in a fair manner and rejected with all respect.

The concluding portion of the work contains a really excellent chapter on St. John's disciples and interesting notes on the relics and cultus of the Saint in Palestine. With regard to his disciples, clear proofs are furnished that they were not a fully-organized body, that the group quickly disintegrated after the master's martyrdom, and that the "Joannites" who appear in the Acts were not real disciples of John continuing as a sect. After brief notes on the alleged "Joannites" of the Clementine Recognitions and on the Hemerobaptists, there comes a most interesting account of the two little known Mandæans. Here Dr. Barton has largely re-written the text, incorporating much of what has been written on Mandaism within the past ten years.

Other sections of outstanding merit are those on the Messianic expectation (pp. 93-101), St. John's Messianic preaching (pp. 107-125) and his martyrdom (pp. 210-228). In the second of these sections we should have welcomed a much more exhaustive treatment of the phrase "Lamb of God." Dr. Barton might well have written a more detailed footnote (p. 117) in defence of the "expiatory" view as against Père Lagrange and Dr. Bernard. In fact, he might have re-written the paragraph. (By the way, in this footnote there is a slight misprint in the name of Fr. Federkiewicz. And he is incorrectly described as a Jesuit: the reviewer knew him three years ago as a secular priest of the diocese of Przemyśl.)

Enough has been said in this brief description of the English edition to show how admirably Dr. Barton has discharged the task of adapting the classic which "is the best life of St. John and will remain for many years the best." He has given of the best of his thoroughly up-to-date Biblical scholarship to provide students with an excellent "Companion" to the study of the Gospels and to furnish preachers with a valuable store whence they can draw treasures, new and old, to point out the Lamb of God, to give testimony, and to make our modern very crooked ways straight.

BERNARD PATTEN.

THE CHURCH AT HOME AND ABROAD

I. ROME.

BY THE REV. R. L. SMITH, Ph.D., M.A.

November has been one of the quietest months of the Holy Year. I do not know why, but it has proved a happy chance as this month has been phenomenally wet, stuffy often, sometimes raw, but with torrential rain nearly every day. Rome needs the sun to bring out the colours of her distempered houses against the white or brown stone of her monuments and the different shades of pines, cypresses and plane trees. We get this necessary sun with the *tramontana* from the snow-clad Abruzzi when there is a coating of ice on the fountain in the early morning, just as we get it in the dog days of July and August, when no breath stirs in the streets. But sun we must have; without it Rome degenerates into drabness and one might as well live in any other large city of the world. The increase of smoke is also very noticeable; from Monte Mario several big chimneys can be seen covering the City with a black haze. Surely something could be done about this. Smoke and rain together are too reminiscent of the industrial north, so that pilgrims who have come to Rome this last month have had little to rejoice the eye, however their hearts may have been lightened. Figures are now being given for September and 400,000 strangers arrived that month; how many came for the *Anno Santo* and how many for the *Mostra della Rivoluzione Fascista* it is hard to say, as Italians, at least, usually combine the two.

The discussion continues in the papers about the proposed Via del Circo Massimo, and opinion seems to be crystallizing in favour of a line more or less along the present Via dei Cerchi; but up to the present there have been no signs of the works beginning, so that we can safely conclude that the problem is still unsettled. The only big project in hand, at the moment, is the isolation of the Castel Sant' Angelo—or, as the contractors' notices have it, the Mole Adriano—which is to be excavated with its mediæval bastions on the land side and surrounded by a park. I cannot describe how it will appear in the end as the unearthing of classical and mediæval structures is going on contemporaneously with the planting of trees and the sodding of open spaces, so that it is all very chaotic to look at. But the park will be a great boon to the inhabitants of the Prati, who have only the piazza Cavour and the Piazza Mazzini for their children to play in. And Sant' Angelo promises to look very imposing from all sides when the work is finished.

In my September notes I praised some of the new churches which were then being built in the City. On closer inspection I must qualify those remarks, for the removal of scaffolding has

revealed several defects. The big temple outside the Ponte Molle, dedicated to the Mother of God, has a superb position, but itself it is quite hideous, all the more so for its pretentiousness. I was glad to see it criticized in the *Avvenire d'Italia*. The balance of dome and campanili is wrong, the height of the drum disproportionate to the flat curve of the dome and the skyline of the façade fails to link the main building with either dome or campanili above it. Only the pedimented porch deserves any genuine admiration, but there is nothing particularly ecclesiastical about it. The church is not to be opened until to-morrow so that I cannot speak of the interior. The dome at Garbatella is also very uninteresting in detail, though its general form is better than, say, the Gesù—but this is faint enough praise! With such models as St. Peter's or Sant' Andrea della Valle, it is extraordinary that Roman architects should have produced so many disappointing domes. The Church of St. Robert Bellarmine in the Piazza Ungheria, has a pleasant brick façade, though everyone criticizes the shape of the west window, but inside it is low and unimpressive. The altars are magnificent and with the doors and the one modern confessional suggest that the furnishings will be better than the church itself. There is a thoroughly "rationalist" building in the Prati, dedicated to our Lady of Peace, which defies convention. The dome, if such be its right name, looks as if the concrete foundation of the drum had been laid, and then the work abruptly suspended. But a photograph of the architect's model shows that it is complete. The exterior of the windowless apse is effective, but the façade is a flat wilderness of brick. The new church at Littoria is far superior to any of these; that proposed for Sabaudia looks a horror on paper. Modern architecture, in Italy at any rate, does not yet seem able to cope successfully with ecclesiastical buildings. I leave the reasons to more competent critics.

In the ecclesiastical world most interest centres at the moment on the various Canonizations. Bernadette and Don Bosco are naturally the favourites. The latter is to be canonized on Easter Sunday, and as Rome is almost booked up for that date already it is hard to foresee what will happen when Turin comes south en masse. At the moment of writing, French pilgrims are pouring into the City and half the population of Lourdes seems to have transferred from the banks of the Gave. Trains brought in six thousand French last night and the nuns of Nevers have taken possession of the basilicas. There are also many beatifications in prospect; the decree of martyrdom has just been read for three Jesuit missionaries killed in Paraguay. So the round of big functions is starting again.

The Spanish elections are over, with their forty odd parties, and the prospects of the Church in Spain are rather brighter than formerly. But coalitions are delicate things and the future is still obscure. The new Cortes will probably see many of those parliamentary bargains which have brought down two

Governments in France during the last few weeks. The position in Germany is very serious from every point of view and flagrant violations of the concordat have produced a state of tension between the Vatican and the Nazi authorities. Between the senile manoeuvres of continental Parliamentaryism and the awful risk of non-Catholic Dictatorship, one may be excused from expressing any preference. Meanwhile, many people have been shocked and humiliated to see the famous tapestries spread from the Capitol in honour of M. Litvinov. But Mussolini's attitude to Russia is both clear and logical. With her internal government he professes no concern; to ostracize her from the comity of nations is to render all European agreements unreal; she is too great a Power to ignore. To recognize Russia is not to approve of Bolshevism and if the balance of trade proves very much to Russia's advantage, that only means that one has been worsted in a bargain. The remedy is not to break off all relations but to drive a better bargain. Such, whatever one thinks of it, is the view taken by Mussolini. President Roosevelt's recognition of the Soviet Republics is based on the same realism, and what hope is there of disarmament in any pact which shall leave out of account the enormous Red army and the Red air force? But the rumours which were going about of a visit to the Pope by M. Litvinov were supremely silly. Until there is some prospect of a break in the Anti-God front, such a visit is out of the question. The Holy Father would never hesitate for a moment to deal with the Kremlin if thereby he might render any service to the persecuted Christians of the U.S.S.R. At present there is no hope of that and therefore no room for an exchange of empty courtesies between the avowed enemies of God and His Vicar.

II. CENTRAL EUROPE.

BY C. F. MELVILLE.

1. *Czechoslovakia.*

A good deal of interest attended the declaration that M. Benes, Minister for Foreign Affairs, had to make in the Czechoslovak Parliament in connection with the incident which took place in September last between the Czechoslovak Government and the Papal Nuncio, Mgr. Ciciaci. Certain indications point to the fact, however, that happily there was nothing that could not be mended about the incident since, just before the Papal Nuncio's departure for his annual holiday to Rome, it was found that the incident could be settled without difficulty, and that relations between Czechoslovakia and the Vatican had not suffered in the meantime. The fact that recently the dignitaries of the Pontifical Chancellery had taken part in the festivities given by the Czechoslovak Legation attached to the Vatican, on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Republic, showed that the ecclesiastic authorities did not desire any rupture.

"In my last exposition," said M. Benes, "I stated that we

were ready to put the finishing touch to the projects to be presented to the Vatican for the putting into definite execution of the *Modus Vivendi*. The preliminary work is to-day terminated, and in three or four weeks at most we shall place our proposals before the Vatican. We shall then enter into direct negotiations with Rome and I hope that we shall arrive quickly at an agreement. On this occasion I wish to remark that in spite of the incident between our Government and the Papal Nuncio, Mgr. Ciriaci, our relations with the Vatican remain as cordial as ever they were in the past; our ecclesiastical policy has not been modified in the least and it will not change. I, personally, have the intention, in any case, of bringing about a satisfactory result to the important work of the *Modus Vivendi*, which, to my mind, is conformable to the interests of our Republic, to those of our Catholics and to those of the Vatican policy. The conclusion of the *Modus Vivendi* in 1927 was a great success for the policy of our State as well as for that of the Holy See. The achievement of this work will be as much a success for one as for the other."

The Foreign Minister's declaration was received with the greatest satisfaction by the House and was commented upon in a very sympathetic manner by the entire Press. Several deputies, whilst declaring themselves to be in perfect agreement with the Minister, asked for explanations on the duration of these pourparlers. They drew the attention of the Minister to the fact that certain Slovak circles were becoming very impatient with the delay, Slovakia being particularly touched by the stipulations of the *Modus Vivendi*. On the 15th November, the Minister replied to these reproaches before the House. He said, amongst other things: "We should appreciate the immense work which has been accomplished. When one considers that we had an extraordinary number of economic questions to solve, the fixing of limits of dioceses, proposals concerning endowments of bishoprics and for forming new dioceses, the solution of the problems of the Greek-Catholic dioceses, the liquidation of the property of the Bishopric of Breslau, and so on, one should be more circumspect and more just in making these reproaches of delay. Much work had to be done, many difficulties of the economic order, and especially political, to be surmounted. We should have liked the work to have gone more rapidly. We are now, however, on the way to its conclusion and ready to present a definite note to the Vatican."

Czechoslovak circles see an interesting precedent in the delimitation in which the Holy See has just proceeded on the Italian-Yugoslav frontier in such a way as to coincide the limits of the dioceses with those of the two States. It is precisely a delimitation of this kind in regard to the Czechoslovak dioceses which constitute the most important stipulation of the *Modus Vivendi*. The relations between Czechoslovakia and the Vatican remain, as can be seen, cordial as ever, and those who hoped to see a rupture have been disappointed.

2. *Austria.*

It has been decided by the Hierarchy in Austria that from now onwards Catholic priests in that country must abstain from taking an active part in politics.

At a recent episcopal conference the following decision was arrived at:—

Consideration was given to the question as to whether, in view of the present delicate political situation, the Catholic clergy should continue to be active as political mandatories. The Conference of Bishops passed a resolution according to which the customary Episcopal consent necessary (in compliance with Canon 139, 4) for the execution of a political mandate by a Catholic priest, should be temporarily withdrawn. Those priests at present holding mandates as National Councillors, Federal Councillors, or as members of Diets or Provincial or Municipal Councils, are requested to resign by the 15th December, 1933. This to apply to all political positions held by Catholic clergy. Any Catholic priest desirous of being politically active must henceforth obtain the special permission of the competent Ordinarius.

Comment on this decision, in Austrian clerical circles, is to the effect that it is but an example of the general policy which has been pursued by the Church for some time past outside Austria. It would be a complete misunderstanding of the situation these circles add, if it were to be assumed that in making this decision the Conference of Bishops was animated by any considerations regarding the present political régime in Austria, it being well known, from repeated enunciations of the Pope, especially at the time of the recent German Catholic Congress in Vienna, that the Catholic Church fully approves of the present Austrian régime. Likewise, the decision should not be accounted for on the grounds of any reservations by the Bishops in regard to the present political régime, as the Bishops, no less than the Vatican itself, approve of the attitude of the Austrian Government and the Christian Social Party.

After these general comments, of a somewhat negative nature, Austrian Clerical comment passes to more particularized and positive explanations. It is pointed out, for instance, in regard to the old tradition in Austria, of priests participating in political life, that this participation was due not to the desire of the clergy but to the wishes of the Catholic laity who had demanded of their spiritual leaders that they should also represent their political interests. The priests will, it is explained, lay down their political burdens in the same spirit in which they took them up. Great names from the past are evoked—the names of famous Catholic clerics who were also politicians—men like Greuzer, Karlom, Scheicher, Schoepfer, Hauser and Seipel—as examples of the beneficent influence of the Catholic clergy upon Austrian political life; but in view of present political developments generally it is felt something

had to be done which would remove all possibility of the Church being reproached for the actions of politicians. The withdrawal of the priests from political life will be a great loss to the Christian Social Party, but the sacrifice has to be made. Catholic laymen must now fill the gaps.

The foregoing explanations, culled from Clerical comment in Vienna, throw some light on what is a dramatic development in the life of the Church in Austria. But, in the view of the writer, the *i*'s are dotted and the *t*'s crossed more clearly in the following comment (also from a clerical source):—That the decision of the Conference of Bishops but introduces into Austria a state of affairs which has existed in Germany since the conclusion of the Concordat between the latter country and the Vatican; and that by removing the difference in this respect between Germany and Austria the Episcopate has removed from the propagandists of the *Dritte Reich* a weapon of propaganda against the existing régime in Austria—in a word, that this clerical *Gleichschaltung* may have done something to obviate a political *Gleichschaltung*.

Do these carefully worded phrases indicate that the Vatican considers the eventual Hitlerization of Austria as inevitable, and is therefore voluntarily withdrawing the clergy from Austrian political life in order to avoid a repetition of what happened in Germany, when the clergy were obliged to withdraw from politics by order of the Nazi Government? (It is true that this situation in Germany was subsequently accepted by the Vatican in the Concordat—but the initiative was on the part of the German Government.) If this be the case, it would appear to indicate that the Vatican, whilst supporting the Dollfuss system, with its promise of a new Constitution based on the idea of the Catholic Corporative State, is nevertheless alive to the possibility of an eventual Nazi triumph in Austria, and is taking steps in advance to be prepared for such an eventuality. This is a reasonable speculation, but at the present stage cannot be anything more definite than speculation.

At all events, it is to be earnestly hoped that such speculation will prove to be inaccurate, as there can be no doubt whatever that the continuance of the Dollfuss "system" is in the best interests of the Catholic Church in Austria. Dr. Dollfuss is, of course, experiencing a number of internal difficulties at the moment, but he has shown such resolution, initiative and sagacity in dealing with problems in the past, that one may venture to hope, not without some degree of confidence, that he will succeed in overcoming his present difficulties. The little Chancellor deserves well both of Europe and the universal Church.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

Perhaps the most important article in the December HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW is Dr. Raoul de Guchteneere's "Physical and Moral Consequences of the Knaus-Ogino Discovery." The writer is impressed by the enormous importance of the Knaus-Ogino discoveries regarding the agenesic period; he foresees "a time when the Knaus-Ogino method will be universally known, and young people will contract marriage with an exact knowledge of the sterile and fertile days" (p. 257). He thinks that the fears expressed by certain Catholic moralists that "periodical continence is simply a stepping-stone to Neo-Malthusianism" may easily be exaggerated and that it is to be expected that "the moral education of our Catholic youth will preserve them from such a total lack of generosity." Throughout the article it is assumed that "the question of the agenesic period has been definitely settled" (p. 256). On this point a well-known moralist, writing in the IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD for November (p. 559) is less positive. "We are of opinion that there is need for caution in regard to acceptance of the medical findings. On the question of the length of time during which the ovum remains fertilizable there has been no direct investigation or direct evidence; there has been an inference from experiments on other animals, such as rabbits. It is quite possible that the human ovum may in certain circumstances remain fertile for several days. A further point—there is no evidence to exclude extraordinary ovulation or the occurrence of ovulation several days before the normal period. With these reserves [he concludes] we, however, must admit that a very strong case has been made for the existence of a sterile period."

In the same number of the RECORD, Fr. R. S. Devane, S.J., in "Shall the Faith die in France," discusses the appalling shortage of priests in most of the French dioceses, with special reference to the diocese of Sens in which some seventy-six per cent. of the clergy are over fifty, and, out of a total of 513 parishes, 323 are without priests. In 1932, 14 priests died, while the annual average of *ordinati* since 1920 has been only 4. In these tragic circumstances the Archbishop, Mgr. Feltin, has appealed to Ireland in the hope of finding "young Irishmen who would be willing to serve as priests in France, to pursue their clerical studies in our seminaries. They would have there every facility for learning our language, for getting into contact with the spirit of our people, and for adapting themselves little by little to the *milieu* that they would have to evangelize later on" (p. 469). The Archbishop shows clearly that the life will be a laborious and difficult one, and one of his suffragans, Mgr. Flynn of Nevers, says: "It is necessary to warn them [i.e., Irish volunteers for French dioceses] that it is truly the work of a 'missionary,' without comfort, in a spirit and a state of poverty, bearable indeed but pretty hard" (p. 470). Fr. Myles Ronan begins a series of historical articles on "The

Diocese of Dublin in its beginnings," and Fr. Seán MacGuairé, C.S.S.R., gives many interesting details on Scottish Catholicity in his complete study: "Ireland and the Catholic Hebrides." In the "Notes and Queries" attention may be called to Dr. Michael Brown's learned disquisition on a recent decision regarding "the Right to act as plaintiff in matrimonial cases" (pp. 525-532); Dr. E. Long re-opens a discussion on the lawfulness of Gothic vestments, apropos of Dom E. Roulin's *Vestments and Vesture*.

THOUGHT for December shows, as usual, a great variety in the articles chosen. Fr. J. F. Kearney, S.J., in "the Story of Zi Ko-Lao," writes with charm and discernment of one who, in the judgment of the Vicar Apostolic of Nankin "has the right to be considered as the first member of Chinese Catholic Action," and whose tercentenary was celebrated on November 8th last. In "Two Poets," Miss C. Maguire contrasts the poetry of Katherine Tynan and Emily Dickinson. (The latter, it may be added, seems stronger in feeling than in rhyme. It is, I think, impossible to consider "His Will" and "illegible" as good rhymes; the same may be said of "air" and "infer"!)

Fr. Leo Keeler, S.J., Professor at the Gregorian University, seeks to clarify St. Augustine's epistemology in "St. Augustine and Error." The present writer contributes a short study on "The Ethiopic Churches, Monophysite and Catholic," and Mr. W. Kuhn in "Fifty Years After" surveys the progress of Communism during the fifty years since the death of Karl Marx. In the book reviews, a number of works on the Oxford Movement are appreciated by Mr. Lancelot Sheppard.

The ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for December has some excellent remarks on "The Decay of Preaching" by Senex, who describes the foundation by the Catholic University of Washington of a Preachers' Institute for the improvement of the standard of sermons among the Catholic clergy. At present, attendance at the meetings of the Institute is voluntary, but Senex has a rather formidable programme for raising the standard, which includes the obligatory submission, by all priests of less than five years' standing, of a monthly sermon on a Sunday Gospel. In "Priests of Two Continents," Fr. A. R. Bandini attempts a comparison between the American and the European clergy; by the latter he means "the clergy of continental Europe and especially of Latin Europe." Some of the points of contrast are amusing. We are told that (in America): "Ecclesiastical gradations as in Europe among parish priests of different degrees are hardly noticeable here. . . . The same may be said concerning seminary or college professors. Like all other teachers, they are recognized as *unavoidable, but as deserving no particular deference*" (p. 590. My italics).

BLACKFRIARS for December contains the usual good mixture of short articles. The first three are, in my judgment, the best three. Dr. Krumbach writes with the authority of a leader of Catholic Action in Germany on "The German Catholic in the New State"; Frances Meredith has some useful "Thoughts on

Maturity"; and Fr. Thomas Gilby, O.P., in "Divertimento for Harmonium," good-naturedly rallies a super-serious Modernist, who lately ventured upon some extremely silly remarks about the Church.

The JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES for October is, as always, more philological than dogmatic. Mr. G. R. Driver continues his valuable "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament," for which he is so peculiarly fitted by his wide knowledge of Semitic languages. Dr. A. L. Williams writes on "The Date of the Epistle of Barnabas," and concludes that it must have been written before A.D. 100. Professor Burkitt's few pages on "The Chester Beatty Papyri" are a valuable study by a textual critic of great experience. Dante students should note a discussion of "The Earth from the Eighth Heaven" (Par. xxii., 133-54), by Professor G. A. Cooke, who calls attention to interesting parallels, or quasi-parallels, in Greek and Babylonian legends. In the review section, Dr. F. R. Tennant discusses the Bishop of Birmingham's *Scientific Theory and Religion* and, though he is rather more complimentary to Dr. Barnes's scientific equipment than was Professor Whittaker in the October DUBLIN, he does not spare criticism. Professor Cooke in his review of Robinson and Oesterley's *History of Israel* has little to say that is not benign, and does not venture upon the type of minutely analytical and entirely devastating review of the book that may be found in the JOURNAL OF THE PALESTINE ORIENTAL SOCIETY, Vol. XII, No. 4, pp. 251-67.

The MONTH for December prints Fr. Martindale's account of his recent pilgrimage "With the Workless in Rome." Mr. J. P. O'Loughlen gives an interesting sketch of "Catholics in Sailortown" and writes as one who has affectionate memories of the first Catholic Seaman's Home, which was opened by Cardinal Vaughan on September 20th, 1893. In "Lourdes and La Salette: A contrast," Fr. Thurston has some pages on St. Bernadette and meets a criticism apropos of his statement in the February number that "the case for La Salette must always be seriously prejudiced by the subsequent extremely unsatisfactory career of the two little visionaries" (p. 168). He concludes that, in regard of Bernadette, "it would almost seem as if Our Blessed Lady, distressed at the scandalous factions and fierce controversies among good Catholics of which the shrine of La Salette has been the centre, decided that at Lourdes her chosen messenger should be of a wholly different type," one who loved obscurity and strove to hide herself, "so far as was humanly possible, from the knowledge of those who sought to pay her honour" (p. 537). Among the smaller articles in the *Miscellanea* section are a sympathetic appreciation of the late Abbot of Downside, a clear study by Miss S. Cunningham of "The Educated Man in the days of St. Thomas and Dante," and a reprint of the revised text of that part of Fr. Joseph Rickaby's "Moral Philosophy," which deals with cruelty to animals.

J. M. T. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

MODERN USURY.

FROM THE REV. F. H. DRINKWATER.

Some Catholics propose the abolition of all interest on loans, but there seems to be no way out of our difficulties in that direction.

In the first place there is surely not the remotest possibility of ever getting such a change enacted into law, and it seems a pity to waste useful energy on working for it.

In the second place, the abolition of interest would not make much difference to the real power of the moneylenders, which comes, as the Pope says, from their power to control credit, and decide who is to receive it. Their inside-knowledge gives them all the opportunities they need of getting rich by manipulating prices and by investment. Through price-manipulation especially they can make it impossible for their clients to repay their loans, so that the securities will fall into their hands. As for pure interest derived from loans, it is comparatively a small matter, and one can even imagine them renouncing it if necessary in order to keep their real power.

In the third place, the abolition of interest can hardly be advocated on moral grounds at this time of day. Catholic theologians have long agreed that although money was not fruitful in the Middle Ages, it must be regarded as fruitful in our own times, and therefore interest can always be charged for a loan whether productive or not. They would say (what is quite undeniable, I think) that the immense changes since the Renaissance—the mariner's compass, the invention of printing, the discoveries of science and their application, the ever-rising standard of comfort and civilized living, in short, the unlimited expansion of production—have created a world in which there is always a profitable investment waiting for the limited amount of gold and silver which is called money, and consequently the lender of money is always entitled to interest to compensate him for the use he might otherwise have made of it. This principle is clearly admitted, by the way, in the new Code of Canon Law, Canon 1543.

In two respects, however, the theologians (as far as my limited acquaintance with them goes) do not seem to have kept themselves fully informed of the rapid developments of modern finance. They are inclined to think of money as necessarily metallic, hardly realizing that modern business can only be carried on by a system of paper money and cheques far in excess of any possible gold or silver backing; consequently, they are not alive to the dangers of the moneylender getting his fingers on the issue of currency at its very source.

Still more serious, the theologians, like nearly everybody else, have still to notice that there is such a thing as credit-creation. Credit-creation in private hands has two bad effects. First, it makes it quite easy for the moneylender to get interest on money which does not exist at all except on his books; or

(an alternative description of the same thing) to get interest ten times over on the same money at the same time. Secondly, it is the machinery by which the moneylender plays his perpetual game of raising and lowering prices at his own will and for his own advantage.

Interest, then, cannot be called unlawful in itself, and we may safely say that a thing which is sanctioned both by the Catholic Code of Canon Law and by the financial code of Soviet Russia is perhaps not likely to be abolished. Interest evidently becomes unlawful when it is excessive, and I suppose even a low interest can be excessive when it is allowed to come before elementary human rights, as, for instance, when debenture shareholders are paid out of an industry which is not paying a living wage to its work-people. Also I cannot see how the charge of unlawful usury can be evaded in those financial operations which now control the issue of money so that it comes into existence always in the form of a debt. And the same has to be said, it seems to me, of all interest charged for overdrafts or new issues of credit, except, of course, the small interest that would represent banking expenses. But the greatest crime of the modern usurer seems to be the deliberate manipulation of prices for private ends, through the expansion and contraction of credit.

Permissu Superiorum.

e
t
y
e
e
g
e
l
s
s
s
t
e
n
n

==
==